# THE ENLISTED SOLDIER OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY: A STUDY OF THE SEVENTH REGIMENT, U.S. INFANTRY, 1815-1860

A Thesis

by

ROBERT PAUL WETTEMANN, JR.

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

December 1995

Major Subject: History

**THE ENLISTED SOLDIER OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY:**

**A STUDY OF THE SEVENTH REGIMENT, U.S. INFANTRY, 1815-1860**

A Thesis

by

ROBERT PAUL WETTEMANN, JR.

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved as to style and content by:

Joseph G. Dawson, III
(Chair of Committee)

Walter D. Kamphoefner
(Member)

D. L. Hamilton
(Member)

Julia K. Blackwelder
(Head of Department)

December 1995

Major Subject: History

## ABSTRACT

The Enlisted Soldier of the United States Army:
A Study of the Seventh Regiment, U.S. Infantry, 1815-1860. (December 1995)
Robert Paul Wettemann, Jr., B.A., Oklahoma State University
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Joseph G. Dawson, III

Throughout the antebellum period, the American public often viewed the regular military establishment with disdain. To some the United States Army represented a threat to the republican traditions it was supposed to defend. At the same time, popular convention held that only those men unwilling, or unable to find a place in society turned to the military as a source of sustenance. Consequently, many recognized the army as a haven for society's dregs, the immigrants, and the dispossessed. Between 1815 and 1860, a wide variety of men enlisted in the Seventh Regiment, United States Infantry, commonly known as the "Cottonbalers," reminiscent of their defense of New Orleans in early 1815. While many members of the regiment fit into the aforementioned categories, particularly during times of national and international depression, famine, and crisis, there were those who joined for more practical reasons. This is particularly true during the latter half of the Mexican War, when the promise of 160 acre land warrants in exchange for military service resulted in the enlistment of a higher percentage of native-born men of limited means. Regardless of these variations, the men who became Cottonbalers made use of the equalizing

influence of the uniform, sought solace in a large military family, and in the process, played a significant role in the settlement of the American frontier.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

Page

# CHAPTER I
# INTRODUCTION

"Good Infantry is, without a doubt, the sinew of an army."

-Napoleon Bonaparte

From 1815 to 1860, the ranks of United States Regular Army were made up primarily of foot soldiers, with between one half and three fourths of the army being composed of infantry, the least prestigious branch of the service. While they did not hold the highest reputation among their peers in the military (or with the American populace for that matter), the infantry certainly formed the "sinews" of the American Army. Throughout the antebellum period, the government of the United States repeatedly called upon the Army, and more particularly, the infantry, to fulfill a myriad of diverse tasks both in times of peace and in times of war. These tasks ranged from those both militarily and politically necessary (overseeing Indian removal, fighting Indians in Florida, waging war against Mexico, and subduing a rebellious religious state), to the more mundane (building roads, constructing forts, and guarding the frontier). Regardless of this great variety of duties, the United States Army, with varying degrees of success, completed many assignments between the end of the War of 1812 and the beginning of the Civil War.

During the antebellum years, perhaps no single regiment earned more

---

The journal model for this thesis is Journal of Military History.

battle honors and maintained more important posts than the Seventh Regiment of Infantry, the "Cottonbalers." Established on 12 April 1808 and originally composed of men from state of Kentucky, the Seventh Regiment emerged from the War of 1812 with a romantic nickname and a prestigious military reputation gained at the Battle of New Orleans, and served the army with distinction for the next forty-five years.[1] Campaigning against the Indians in Florida during the First and later the Second Seminole War, maintaining critical posts in Indian Territory both before and after Indian removal, and waging war against Mexico, the officers and men of the Seventh amassed a military record which few regiments rivaled and others envied. All this was accomplished prior to their surrender to Confederate forces in Texas in July 1861.[2]

However, to focus solely upon the battles and officers of the Seventh Regiment is to ignore the otherwise faceless mass of common men who provided not only the mainstay of a regiment but also the sinews of an army. An approach limited to military campaigns ignores the variety of national political, economic, and social, factors which drove the "unsophisticated, the untutored, and intractable sons of Erin," to military service.[3] While the affairs of the army officer corps are well documented, as most of them were literate and left diaries, letters, and memoirs, the enlisted men of the army, the lowest men on both the military and societal ladder, the men largely responsible for the success of American arms throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, left few written records. Until only recently, this nameless, faceless mass of the Army has been largely ignored, as it was the battles, the great men, and the great leaders who received the lion's share of the attention from both authors and the reading public.

This study will assess the composition of the enlisted men in the United States Army, using the Seventh U.S. Infantry Regiment as a case study. While the battlefield exploits of the Cottonbalers over a forty-five year period cannot be ignored, they are not the emphasis of this study. Rather, through the examination of the affairs and actions of a single regiment, it is possible to focus with greater detail upon the events and circumstances which influenced the lives of the enlisted men between 1815 and 1860. Additionally, the examination of a single regiment allows one to analyze the various national, societal and economic trends which may have influenced the enlisted men of this regiment, a task which becomes more difficult when one elects to examine the entire army.

The notion of a regimental history is by no means new. Other writers have sought to preserve the legacies of single regiments through accounts of their battles, campaigns, and experiences. In the years prior to the Civil War, most regimental histories were simply memoirs or journals composed primarily by officers who commanded military units on various journeys through unexplored regions of the country, often written in a style reminiscent of the journals of Meriwether Louis and William Clark. The Adventures of Captain Bonneville, U.S.A. in the Rocky Mountains and the Far West, prepared by Washington Irving and first published in 1837, is a representative example. Irving compiled this narrative from the journals of Captain Benjamin Bonneville, who served with the Seventh regiment from 1821 to 1831. At that time, Bonneville, by order of Major General Alexander Macomb, Commanding General of the Army, took a leave of absence from the army for the purpose of "exploring the country to the Rocky Mountains." Although Bonneville overstayed his leave of absence, Irving's account of the

captain's three and one-half year trek through the Rocky Mountains nonetheless serves as an example of military historical narrative of the nineteenth century. [4]

In a similar fashion, another member of the Seventh also made a record of his experiences while wearing the army blue. Private Charles Martin Gray, an enlisted man in the regiment between 1819 and 1829, published The Old Soldier's Story in 1868, in which he chronicles his "exciting incidents of army life." Gray narrates the affairs of Company A of the Seventh and its actions during the First Seminole War, as well as their duties on the southwestern frontier. This narrative is important for providing one of the few existing accounts written from the perspective of a member of the rank and file.[5]

The Seventh was not the only regiment whose officers and enlisted personnel elected to make a public record of their military experiences. The letters of Major General George McCall, who served with the Fourth Infantry Regiment and rose through the grades following his graduation from West Point in 1822, were published in 1868, shortly after the conclusion of the Civil War. These letters chronicle not only his peacetime duties in Pensacola, Florida, in the 1820s and `30s, but also his military campaigns during the Second Seminole and Mexican Wars, concluding with his duties as inspector general on the Pacific Coast. McCall's letters typify the types of records left by those who chose not to prepare a narrative of their adventures.[6]

That is not to say, however, that other adventure narratives were not published. The military adventures of Colonel Randolph Marcy, an 1828 graduate of West Point and an officer in the Fifth Infantry, were published in

1866, under the title, Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border. It contains a colorful record of Marcy's dealings with the Plains Indians between 1830 and 1860, chronicling their culture and way of life as well as providing information regarding the composition and character of the army during that period.[7]

Army officers were not the only ones to pen memoirs of time spent in the service of the United States government. Teresa Griffin Viele, wife of Captain Egbert Ludovickus Viele published Following the Drum in 1864, in which she chronicled her experiences while accompanying her husband, a captain with the First Infantry Regiment.[8] First stationed at a recruiting depot in Burlington, New York, she observed army life not only at that location, but also at Ringgold Barracks, Texas, on the lower Rio Grande, where Viele was stationed in the decades after the Mexican War.

The American Civil War generated a great interest in regimental histories, in most cases authored by individuals who either commanded or served in the various regiments. Like the earlier accounts, these are primarily memoirs and journals, written either by officers justifying or defending their actions, or by individual soldiers chronicling their adventures while in uniform. While most of these accounts are outside the parameters of this study, it should be remembered that the American Civil War greatly stimulated interest in the records of military units in America, as men who wore both the blue and the gray sought to preserve the legacies of their service for posterity.

The first regimental histories written after the Civil War were created from personal journals, letters, and regimental records from the recent conflict. Theophilus F. Rodenbaugh and William L. Haskin provided an

example of this sort of account in their Army of the United States: Historical Sketches of the Staff and Line with Portraits of the Generals-in-Chief. These histories, which originally appeared in the Journal of the Military Service Institution between 1892 and 1896, were published with the primary intention of maintaining the "legends and traditions" of the various regiments in order to foster an *esprit de corps* at a time when the reorganization of the army had confused the identity and military legacies of the various regiments. Their efforts, while commendable, offer little more than a record of the wartime exploits of each regiment, as the lion's share of the history they provide for each regiment was concentrated upon the actions of the regiments in recent years, no doubt due to a reliance upon contemporary military records by the respective authors.[9]

Naturally, some of the individual regiments prepared their own regimental histories. These offered a more in-depth examination of the duties, victories, and experiences of those units. Such a narrative was published by the Seventh in 1956, and offers an account of the regiment's actions since its creation in 1808. While informative as to the posts and locations the Seventh occupied, it offered little with respect to the composition of the rank and file. As with most regimental histories of the period, its primary emphasis was on campaigns and battles, as those distinctive events helped give regiments their identity.[10]

However, memoirs, journals, and official regimental histories were not the only sources utilized by scholars who elected to study military affairs. In a quest to provide a more objective view of the martial establishment, early historians examined accounts of the army provided by foreign tourists and American civilians who commented upon the state of the American

fighting man in the journals they wrote during the course of their travels. While they often only provided one or two sentences which addressed the status of the rank and file, the comments of individuals like Alexis De Tocqueville, James Fenimore Cooper, 'The Rambler' Charles Latrobe, and numerous others are nonetheless important in an attempt to assess the general character of the American military establishment.[11]

This rich literary legacy was instrumental in the formation of much of the early American military history, principally for the fact that the comments were recorded by civilians and hence offered outsiders' views, not seeking to glorify the affairs of any individual or unit in the army. While these records of travelers' views of the army are an important legacy, they are not without their shortcomings. They are the record of the views of a literate few whose perceptions may not have been representative of the country. Moreover, while these accounts provide illustrative snapshots of a small portion of the army at a given point in time, based solely upon the impressions of outside observers, they rarely made reference to which regiment they happened to see. As a result, many of these comments were applied to the army writ large. Therefore, it is difficult to utilize these accounts in the preparation of a regimental history, as there are but a few occasions where one can be reasonably sure as to which units the writer observed. Such was the case with Charles Latrobe when he compared the composition of the Mounted Ranger Battalion (with which he made the "tour on the prairies" in 1832), with the character of the recruits for the dragoons which he viewed one year later.[12]

To solve these problems, scholars began to tap into the vast reserve of military documents maintained at various locations throughout the country

to augment the personal narratives and create a more comprehensive view of the army and its regiments. The reports of the Inspector General of the Army, the Annual Reports of the Secretary of War, and other reports published by the government offer important information regarding the frontier army, its composition, and its daily affairs. However, these too are limited, as in most cases, they illuminate only specific locations and specific regiments at a given moment in time, or provided statistical information with little interpretative aids.

The reports of the inspector general are by far the most illustrative of these sorts of documents. Francis Paul Prucha's Army Life on the Western Frontier provides an edited compilation of the reports of one of these individuals, Colonel George Croghan, who served as inspector general between 1826 and 1845.[13] In it, Prucha offers selected comments on military policy, forts, administration, supplies, equipment, and upon the men of the various posts Croghan visited during that period. While these selections do provide a valuable record of the early western garrisons (of which posts occupied by the Seventh Infantry were inspected in 1827 and again in 1844), again they are little more than illustrative snapshots of a particular place at a particular point in time.

Likewise, the Annual Reports of the Secretary of War also provide an annual portrait, but of the entire army. Collected each year and reported to Congress, these reports offer a record of the strength, disposition, and location, of the army as well as provide a register of the officers for each of the regiments, whether they be artillery, mounted, or infantry. Additionally, the annual reports provide other details with respect to the operations of the

various military units, the military academy, and the general staff for the previous year.[14]

Memoirs and journals, coupled with the later regimental histories, official reports and valuable personal narratives provided the foundation for much of the military history published throughout the first three fourths of the twentieth century. This was the drums and trumpets of the old military history, with its emphasis on the great captains, weapons, tactics, and operations, with little regard for anything else, particularly the common soldier, and especially any interaction between the army and society.[15] The interest in regimental histories, the activities and actions of the individual regiments, had declined, as several scholars sought to integrate the military into the realm of mainstream history, and in doing so offered a narrative history of the military affairs of the United States from the colonial times to the present.

One of the earliest attempts at a comprehensive American military history is found in Brevet Brigadier General George Forsyth's The Story of the Soldier. While his primary emphasis was the period after the American Civil War, Forsyth did offer an account of the American military establishment since the colonial period. However, this study was not without its faults. Forsyth not only ignored the events of the American Civil War in its entirety, but as with the regimental histories of Rodenbaugh and Haskins, his emphasis was upon those periods with which he was most familiar, that being the western campaigns in which he served as aide to General Phil Sheridan. In many respects, Forsyth's Story can be likened to the adventure narratives of Bonneville and Marcy, as they all contain many of the same stylistic elements and colorful narrative of western campaigns.[16]

Four years after the publication of Forsyth's Story, Emory Upton's Military Policy of the United States was published. Although an unfinished compilation of Upton's notes on the Army, it was nonetheless a comprehensive study of the American Military establishment and the important policy changes from the American Revolution through the middle of the Civil War. It was perhaps the most important non-book ever published, as it provided the impetus for many of the reforms which would take place in later years. While not a work of military history in the scholarly sense, it cannot be ignored for its analysis of military campaigns and policy in the era of the "old army."[17]

William Addleman Ganoe provided a more sophisticated account not of campaigns and battles, but of the "homely and the heroic service of the soldier in the sweat of peace as well as in the ruck of war," in his monumental History of the United States Army, published in 1924. While not without its faults, it was the first attempt at a comprehensive history of the American military establishment, from its "drab beginnings" to its "renaissance" at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century.[18] While it lacks much of the detail of later comprehensive military histories, it did provide a hint of what was to be published by American military historians in the future.

Some twenty-five years after the publication of Ganoe's History, the most sophisticated study of the army enlisted man appeared. John Joseph Lenney's Rankers, published in 1950, presented an in depth analysis of the plight and circumstances of the American and British enlisted soldier, prepared from a variety of narrative and statistical records. While its primary purpose was to study promotion from the ranks in the regular army

of the United States, Lenney did offer what was perhaps the first serious analysis of the enlisted men in the army, and his social, economic and moral status, drawn from a variety of congressional reports and official military publications.[19]

As scholars began applying more rigorous methodology to the study of American military history, the resulting scholarship displayed higher levels of sophistication. Russell F. Weigley's History of the United States Army, published in 1967, offered a succinct study of the army as an American institution. Other scholars studied military history by emphasizing specific time periods, or by analyzing the military affairs of a particular region, approaches adopted by Edgar P. Wesley, Francis Paul Prucha, and Robert M. Utley.[20]

While the interests of these scholars was directed primarily towards strategy, tactics, and the affairs of the officers and armies in the various military campaigns, the advent of the new social history and the development of various sub-disciplines within the historical profession directed more attention to the day-to-day affairs of the army and more important, the lives, character, and composition of the rank and file. These attempts at social/military history usually resulted in either one of two things: either a general history, present as a chapter of a larger work[21], or a weapons and forts history of how the soldiers lived, an often disjointed discussion of the various arms, accouterments, and habitations of the soldier -- a home economics history of military life.[22]

This call for a new social history was closely paralleled by a call for a new military history, a more sophisticated critique of military history, its methods, and its goals. As early as 1968, Jesse Lemisch made the call for a

military history written "from the bottom up" in his discussion of the impressment of American sailors in the American Revolution, as "the history of the powerless, the inarticulate, and the poor, has not yet begun to be written because they have been treated no more fairly by historians than they have been treated by their contemporaries."[23] Richard H. Kohn echoed these sentiments in his "Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research." Kohn noted that by largely ignoring the enlisted man, historians had failed to answer such elementary questions such as who these enlisted men were, why they joined the army, what they thought, why they fought, and what impact their service had on them and they on they nation?[24]

Scholars of the American army responded to these requests for a new military history, with their efforts manifested both in popular and scholarly presses. John Elting's American Army Life , and Henry I. Kurtz's article, Soldier's Life, which appeared in American History Illustrated, are both typical of the home economics history of the American military. They sought to discuss many of the various aspects of military living, yet did so without the sophisticated methodology and documentation of academic scholars. While both are important from a historiographical perspective, other scholars forwarded the new military history through more involved research.[25]

Rigorous research on the social character of the American military often resulted in involved discussions of the the relationship between the American military and the American society. Marcus Cunliffe defined a triple heritage of the American military in his study of the military ethos between the Revolution and the Civil War: the antimilitarist, the

antiprofessional or amateur, and the professional. These themes were further examined by John Shy in A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and the American Character, 1775-1783, though Shy emphasized the complex relationship between the army and society during the American Revolution.[26] Others followed the lead of Shy in emphasizing individual wars. John Elting's Amateurs to Arms: A Military History of the War of 1812, Lawrence Cress's Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812, James McCaffrey's Army of Manifest Destiny , and Robert Johannsen's To the Halls of the Montezumas, all are typical of the new military history in that their primary emphasis was either the enlisted man in the army or the relationship between the army and society during conflicts both before and after the "thirty years peace."[27]

That is not to say that the affairs of the army in peacetime were ignored. Edward Coffman's The Old Army:. A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898, is the most comprehensive study to date. Coffman's book, which discusses the lives and experiences of officers, enlisted men, and women and children who were in some way associated with the army, is by far most substantial account of the peacetime American Army in the nineteenth century. Based upon primary journals, memoirs, and government reports, his anecdotal and analytical narrative provides numerous colorful illustrations of life in the peacetime army. Although the inclusion of a vast quantity of personal accounts necessitates its mention in any discussion of nineteenth-century American military history, Coffman elected not to utilize the vast repositories of military records which would have allowed for the creation of a portrait of the army "from the bottom up."[28]

The personnel records of the American fighting man were not ignored, however. J.C.A. Stagg, in his preliminary examination of the enlisted men during the War of 1812, has provided a model by which other scholars can examine military records in hopes of adding to the understanding of the United States Army. A cold and impersonal contrast to Coffman's insightful and often humorous personal accounts, Stagg's quantitative analysis of enlistment records represented a giant step forward in emphasizing the army "from the bottom up."[29] However, there still remained a middle ground, which integrated elements of both quantification and personal narrative into the study of the rank and file of the army.

Dale Steinhauer's doctoral dissertation "Sogers: Enlisted Men in the U.S. Army, 1815-1860" is an example of such an effort. Through utilization of pertinent enlistment records, muster rolls, regimental returns, court-martial records as well as the aforementioned primary accounts, Steinhauer sought to assemble a broader impression of the social character of the United States Army. Although ostensibly a study of the problems of drunkenness and desertion between 1815 and 1860, Steinhauer presented a quantitative study of the enlisted man, based on a 5 percent sample and augmented by known written accounts left by enlisted men during that period. Introducing important methodology into the study of military history, Steinhauer's 5 percent sample, examined for three time periods (1826-1846, 1846-1848, and 1848-1860), prevented the introduction of variables such as change of location, illness, and warfare and their impact on enlisted men, all of which are possible in a regimental study which examines a regiment on a year-by-year basis.[30]

Despite the innovations of these recent studies, the notion of variation between regiments has been largely ignored. It must be recognized that each regiment, though serving under the direction of the United States War Department, was in fact unique, with its own specific posts, duties, officers, and more important, enlisted men. To address these differences, some scholars have elected to examine an individual regiments, asking new questions and utilizing new approaches in hopes of shedding new light upon the discussion of what was otherwise old topics and ideas. Of these, Hugh Rankin's monumental study, North Carolina Continentals, is perhaps the finest example of a unit history prepared since the advent of the "new military history." In it, Rankin examines the role of the North Carolina Regiments in the American Revolution, providing not only a record of the campaigns in which the regiments were involved, but also the impact of the war on North Carolina.[31] In light of Rankin's treatment of the North Carolina Continentals, it would seem that such an approach could also be applied to other regiments in later periods.

This brief historiographical review lays the foundation for an examination of the Seventh Regiment of Infantry. The Seventh Regiment was involved in all of the major military conflicts between 1815 and 1860, as was a large portion of the remainder of the American Army. In particular, the Seventh was heavily involved in the First Seminole War (1817-18), and between 1824-1839 maintained many important posts in Indian Territory. These duties undoubtedly had a unique consequences upon the rank and file. At the same time, a variety of national, international, economic, social and political events were not without their effects as well. Therefore, the emphasis upon a single regiment as a microcosm of the army allows for the

examination of these trends in greater detail, things which are difficult to do in an analysis of the entire army. It is the goal of this study to go beyond simple regimental history of the "old military history," by placing the affairs of the enlisted men of the Seventh Regiment not only within the context of American military affairs, but within the larger realm of American history.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Seventh U.S. Infantry, Seventh U.S. Infantry: 1929 Yearbook (Vancouver Barracks, Washington: privately printed, 1929), James Wallace Hammack, Jr., Kentucky and the Second American Revolution (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1976).

2. For a complete record of these engagements, consult Seventh U.S. Infantry, Seventh U.S. Infantry: 1929 Yearbook (Vancouver Barracks, Washington: privately printed, 1929), and Theophilus Francis Rodenbaugh and William L. Haskins, The Army of the United States: Historical Sketches of Staff and Line with Portraits of Generals-In-Chief (New York: Maynard, Merrill and Co., 1896), 498-510. The Seventh regiment maintained this reputation despite surrendering to Confederate forces at the beginning of the Civil War, events which are chronicled by John W. Wike in "Colors, Colors, Who's Got the Colors: An Episode in the History of the Seventh Infantry," Military Collector and Historian 4 (December 1952): 91-92.

3. George McCall, Letters from the Frontiers (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1868; reprint, Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1974), 334.

4. See Major General Alexander Macomb to Captain B.L.E. Bonneville, in Edgeley W. Todd, ed., The Adventures of Captain Bonneville, U.S.A., in the Rocky Mountains and the Far West, digested from his journals by Washington Irving (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961), 380-81, and Washington Irving, The Adventures of Captain Bonneville, U.S.A., in

the Rocky Mountains and the Far West, 2d ed. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1868).

5. Charles Martin Gray, The Old Soldier's Story: The Autobiography of Charles Martin Gray, Company A, Seventh Regiment U.S.I., Embracing Interesting and Exciting Incidents of Army Life on the Frontier in the Early Part of the Century (Edgefield, SC: Edgefield Advertiser, 1868).

6. George McCall, Letters from the Frontiers (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1868; reprint, Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1974).

7. Colonel Randolph B. Marcy, Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border (New York: Harper and Brothers 1866).

8. Teresa Griffin Viele, Following the Drum (Philadelphia: T.B. Peterson and Brothers, 1864); Her husband achieved the rank of Brigadier General of the Volunteers during the Civil War, as noted in Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903), 1: 987.

9. Rodenbaugh and Haskins, Army of the United States, ix, x.

10. History of the "Cottonbalers," 7th Infantry Regiment (Baton Rouge: Army and Navy Publishing Company, 1956). For a similar account of another regiment see Frederick B. Shaw, One Hundred Forty Years of Service in Peace and War: The History of the Second Infantry, U.S. Army (Detroit: Strathmore Press, 1930).

11. For colorful comments on both the army and the rank and file, see James Fenimore Cooper, Notions of the Americans, picked up by a Traveling Bachelor (London: Henry Colburn, 1828), Alexis De Tocqueville, Democracy in America (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862),

Charles Joseph Latrobe, The Rambler in North America 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1835), Washington Irving, A Tour on the Prairies (London: J. Murray, 1835), and Francis Paul Prucha, "The United States Army as Viewed by British Travelers," Military Affairs 17 (Fall 1953): 113-124.

12. Latrobe, The Rambler in North America , 2: 230-231.

13. Francis Paul Prucha, Army Life on the Western Frontier: Selections from the Official Reports made between 1826 and 1845 by Colonel George Croghan (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958).

14. The Annual Reports of the Secretary of War can be found in U.S. Congress, American State Papers: Military Affairs (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1832-1861), and includes those submitted to Congress between 1821 and 1837. Reports submitted between 1833 and 1860 can be found the Senate Executive Documents published as part of the Congressional Serial Set.

15. Peter Paret, "The New Military History" Parameters 21 (Fall 1991): 10-18.

16. Heitman, Historical Register, 1: 430, and George A. Forsyth, The Story of the Soldier (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1900).

17. Emory Upton, The Military Policy of the United States (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1904).

18. William Addleman Ganoe, The History of the United States Army (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1924).

19. John Joseph Lenney, Rankers: The Odyssey of the Enlisted Regular Soldier of America and Britain (New York: Greenberg Publishing Co., 1950).

20. See Edgar P. Wesley, Guarding the Frontier: A Study of Frontier Defense. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935).

21. See Francis Paul Prucha, "Agents of Empire" chap. in The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army and the Frontier, 1783-1846 (New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprint, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 319-338 and Robert Utley, "The Frontier Army, 1848-61" chap. in Frontiersman in Blue: The U.S. Army and the Indian, 1848-1865 (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 18-58.

22. For a more succinct discussion of these two early examples of social history, see Rowland Berthoff, An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), xi.

23. Jesse Lemisch, "The American Revolution from the Bottom Up" in Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History, ed. Barton J. Bernstein (New York: Pantheon Books, 1968), 29.

24. Richard H. Kohn, "The Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research," American History Review 86 (June 1981): 553-567, quote on 554.

25. John Elting, American Army Life (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982), Henry I. Kurtz, "Soldier's Life," American History Illustrated 7(1972), 24-35.

26. Marcus Cunliffe, Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865 (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1968), and John Shy, A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

27. John Elting, Amateurs to Arms: A Military History of the War of 1812 (Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 1991), Lawrence Cress, Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War

of 1812 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), and James McCaffrey, Army of Manifest Destiny: The American Soldier in the Mexican War, 1846-1848 (New York: New York University Press, 1992).

28. Edward Coffman, The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

29. J.C.A. Stagg, "The Enlisted Men in the United States Army, 1812-1815: A Preliminary Survey," William & Mary Quarterly 43 (October 1986): 615-645.

30. Dale Steinhauer, "'Sogers': Enlisted Men in the U.S. Army, 1815-1860" (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina, 1992).

31. Hugh F. Rankin, The North Carolina Continentals (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), 1971.

## CHAPTER II

## COTTONBALERS BY GOD!: 1815-1830

"More could not have been expected from veterans inured to war."

-Andrew Jackson, 9 January 1815[1]

Shortly after 6:00 on the morning of 8 January 1815, a single rocket shot across the sky over McCarty's plantation, signaling the start of the British assault upon American positions which defended the approaches to New Orleans. For the next two hours, approximately five thousand American regulars, militia, Baratarian pirates and citizens of New Orleans defended a one-mile long mud rampart against British troops directed by Major General Sir Edward Packenham, brother-in-law of General Sir Arthur Wellesley, First Duke of Wellington. When the battle was over, the British army, composed of many veterans of the Waterloo and the Peninsular Campaigns, limped from the field having lost nearly half of their five thousand man army either killed or wounded, while the motley American army under the command of General Andrew Jackson remained secure behind their earthworks, having suffered only a handful of casualties.[2]

From this day forward, the Seventh Regiment of Infantry, posted on the right of the American line on that damp January morning, was known as the "Cottonbalers," as it was generally believed that the American forces under Jackson's command manned defensive lines composed of hastily stacked bales of cotton, a notion now known to nothing more than a romantic tale. Because of their battlefield performance, the men of the

Seventh also earned the reputation as a well-trained fighting force, a renown which would only be enhanced by the wartime exploits of later decades. The battlefield honors of the Seventh Infantry earned since 1815 are memorialized in the decorations, citations and battle streamers which adorn the regimental colors, and attest to the mettle of the unit.[3] However, apart from these distinctions, little is known of the men who marched behind those standards.

Volumes have been written on the military and political careers of Andrew Jackson, Zachary Taylor, and other distinguished officers who commanded elements of the Seventh, the lives of the men they led have not been subjected to such scrutiny, except when these soldiers are considered in a study of a military campaign, a post history, or the treatment of the entire army.[4] With a past emphasis upon battles and leaders, the social origins of the rank and file and the various factors which might have motivated them either before or during their military careers has been largely ignored. These factors, in most cases a result of the actions, duties and posts occupied by the individual regiment, are unique, varying among the different units. Therefore, the study of a single regiment is relevant not only as a means to more clearly define these distinctions, but also to focus with more detail upon greater trends which encompass the entire army.

The spectacular conclusion of the War of 1812 awakened nationalistic sentiments in the young United States. Free from any significant external threat following the great victory at New Orleans, the United States prospered over the next decades as the beginnings of the industrial and transportation revolutions changed the nation both socially and economically. Although the advent of "Manifest Destiny" was a number of

years away, a successful end to the war seemed to secure American pre-eminence upon the North American continent. In spite of a peace settlement confirming the *status quo ante-bellum*, many politicians nonetheless recognized that the United States could not maintain its position without some sort of military force for national defense.[5]

In the fifteen years following the Treaty of Ghent, the peacetime United States Army varied in size between six and ten thousand men as wrangling politicians were engaged in an almost constant debate over both the size, and purpose of the nation's fighting force. Partisan politics, prejudice against a professional military establishment, and the belief in the successes of the American militia, feelings fostered both by Jackson's victory at New Orleans (despite the fact that the heaviest fighting was sustained by artillerymen and regulars, not the volunteers), prevented the adoption of any systematic policy towards the army. While changes during the "era of reform" between 1815 and 1821 would lead to the beginnings of a professional military establishment, in the meantime the army sought to complete its various duties with varying degrees of success, utilizing every available resource at its disposal.[6]

The end of the War of 1812 brought Congress to reduce these resources and institute significant changes in the American military. Expecting to "dismiss as many of the officers and men" as necessary, yet still maintain a force large enough to defend American borders, Congress passed "an Act Fixing the Peacetime Military Establishment of the United States" to go into affect on May 17, 1815. With its passage, a substantial peacetime military force was maintained in the United States for the first time, as the act provided for the reduction of the army to a force of ten thousand men.[7] This

was accomplished by discharging both a number of the officers, as well as members of the rank and file, with those who remained being placed in new regiments, regardless of their previous unit, its honors and distinctions.[8]

The officers and men of the Cottonbalers, serving in one of the only regiments to emerge from the War of 1812 with a reputation enhanced by performance on the battlefield, must have felt slighted by the reorganization, as the units of the army were "diabolically jumbled."[9] While an officer who chronicled the history of a sister infantry regiment theorized that the reorganization, "did not effect the continuity of the regiments, their history or traditions," he nonetheless noted that it "must have affected their esprit considerably: an asset that was probably not even considered."[10]

As a result of the reorganization, the old Seventh, which contained many veterans of New Orleans who proudly bore the Cottonbaler name, ceased to exist. It was amalgamated with elements of the Second, Third and Forty-Fourth Regiments of Infantry, placed under the command of Colonel Daniel Bissell, formerly of the old First Infantry. Henceforth, this unit was referred to as the First Infantry. A new Seventh regiment was formed from elements of the Eighth, Twenty-Fourth, and Thirty-Ninth Infantry regiments, to be commanded by Colonel James McDonald, an officer formerly with the Fourth Rifle Regiment.[11] Although the "Cottonbaler" nickname was lost by many veterans of New Orleans, it was not forgotten, as the men of the new Seventh adopted it, later incorporating both the name and the image it suggested into the regimental crest and coat of arms.[12]

In the fifteen years which followed the reorganization, the Seventh regiment was called upon to perform many different tasks. Whether ordered to suppress the actions of hostile Seminole Indians and renegade blacks in

Florida, provide a show of force necessary to help settle the Florida boundary dispute with Spain, or police the southwestern borders of the United States in Louisiana and Arkansas territory, the Cottonbalers distinguished themselves both on and off the field of battle during the first half of the "Thirty Years Peace." While a detailed discussion of military policy in the southwest is not the primary emphasis of this study, the duties undertaken at these locales can be considered representative of the army's roles during this period, as the tasks with which they were entrusted, particularly those concerning defense of the borders, were not unlike those assigned to other regiments of the army. Moreover, while national and international social and economic events were influential in directing large numbers of men towards enlistment in the military, the locations at which the Seventh Infantry was posted and the events which ensued at these sites must not be forgotten. The circumstances at these posts, which the rank and file faced every day, were the most influential upon the enlisted men.

The Seventh's tasks can be considered typical for the responsibilities delegated to the army between 1815 and 1830. Similarly, the composition of the rank and file of this regiment can be viewed as representative of the makeup of the army as a whole during the same period. Thus, the conclusions derived from an analysis of the rank and file of the Seventh Regiment of Infantry are significant, for they not only reveal what type of men served bearing the sobriquet "Cottonbalers," but also reveal much about the composition of the entire United States Army during this period. Moreover, by studying enlistments in the Seventh Regiment, it is possible to focus with more clarity upon enlistment patterns in this sample, which in

turn can be applied and tested against similar trends present in the entire army.

J.C.A. Stagg, in his analysis of the enlistments in the United States Army during the War of 1812, recognized that during the war "the army did recruit, and probably retained, a greater number of men . . . than the War Department knew at the time." He estimated that during the course of the war, some 62,430 enlisted in the army. His evidence suggests that these enlistees were not the poor and the destitute but, instead represented a "broader range of men from more ordinary backgrounds" who were needed to fill the ranks for the prosecution of the war. Moreover, Stagg indicates that those recruits were of respectable social status or were "close to the margins of respectability."[13] During times of war, rage militaire, defined by Charles Royster in his discussion of the American Revolution as a "passion for arms," often dominated popular opinion, and as a result of this infatuation with things military, a significant number of men usually joined the army, largely motivated by peer-pressure and patriotism. In contrast, motivations for enlistment in a peacetime army are more enigmatic, and require that one address broad generalizations before moving to the specific.[14]

Based upon the republican attitudes against a professional army and the popularly-held view of the army prior to 1812, Charles Latrobe's observation of an American army composed of the "scum of the population of the older States, or of the worthless German, Irish or English immigrants," might appear to be true, as similar notions were described by a number of contemporary observers.[15] However, upon closer examination of the Seventh Infantry, this does not appear to be the case. While both the "scum

of the older states," marginal farmers and destitute unskilled laborers, as well as the "worthless immigrants," recent émigrés from Europe, were represented in the multitudes who joined the army between 1815 and 1830, many of the enlistees do not fit into either one of these categories. Although the diversity of the origins of these individuals, as well as their varying social and regional characteristics makes any sort of precise determination impossible, the study of a significant number of individuals can at least illuminate some of the social forces which would drive men to enlist in this period.

Throughout the antebellum years, all recruits were volunteers, and it was often difficult to find enough willing and able young men to fill the ranks of the army to its authorized size, as is apparent in Table 2.1. Very rarely did the actual size of the regiment equal the strength at which it was authorized, and as a result, recruiting was a constantly necessary to fill not only the ranks of the army, but the Seventh regiment as well. As the regiment was part of the army, both drew recruits from the same population.

In the years immediately following the War of 1812, recruitment was carried out under the methods authorized in the "Rules and Regulations of the Army for 1813." Under these regulations, the United States was divided into nine recruiting districts, with each regiment (or regiments) recruiting from an assigned district. Although the Seventh Infantry was originally raised in the state of Kentucky beginning in 1813 the regiment was recruited from the seventh military district, composed of Tennessee, Louisiana and Mississippi, and continued to do so until 1821.[16]

In 1821, the first comprehensive regulations issued to the army since 1813 eliminated regimental recruiting by districts, and placed the

responsibility for recruitment of enlisted men upon the colonels of the individual regiments. Colonels were authorized to detail one of the senior officers from the regiment (often the major, or senior captain) as well as a number of junior officers and noncommissioned officers to regional recruiting rendezvouses, established by the superintendents of the department. At these locations, they were to seek out new enlistees, dependent upon the immediate needs of the regiment. In 1825, the War Department changed recruitment methods, removing the responsibility of recruiting from the colonels and officers of the various regiments, and returning it to the commanding general of the army.[17]

That is not to say that the regimental commanders were entirely freed from the need to recruit men. Often, the general recruiting service was unable to fill the ranks with qualified recruits. When that was the case, regimental commanders, acting under the auspices of the military departmental headquarters, detached an officer (or officers) from the most under strength company to recruit in a previously outlined geographic area. Regimental recruiting parties reported their progress directly to the adjutant general on a monthly basis.[18]

When considering enlistment in the Seventh Infantry, it is first necessary to determine when these individuals enlisted. In Table 2.2, the efforts of the recruiting service are summarized. While these statistics may not appear remarkable, closer scrutiny reveals that recruiting efforts, their success, or lack thereof, closely correspond to various economic and military events which took place in the United States during the same period. Based upon these numbers, three general patterns appear between 1815 and 1830. In the years which followed both 1815 and 1821, a relatively small number of

men sought service in the regiment. In contrast, 1819 and 1820 were marked by a much higher number of new enlistees than in previous years, or in the years that followed. These trends can be directly linked to three major national events.

The military reorganization and reduction of 1815 filled most regiments to capacity. As a result, few men were needed to fill the ranks in 1815, 1816, and 1817. Hence, it would appear that those retained in the army following the reorganization had at least three years remaining on their enlistment, as it was not until 1818 that a relatively large number of recruits (179) were required by the Seventh Regiment.

Likewise, the reorganization of 1821 had a similar effect upon enlistments, as the reduction in force from 12,383 to 6,126 men reduced the number of men required annually by the United States Army.[19] While a dramatic regimental reorganization did not take place at this time, the individual regiments were again reduced in strength. Based upon the number of enlistments for the Seventh regiment, it is possible to postulate that those retained after the 1821 reorganization were of similar character to those retained in 1815. The number of recruits who enlisted in the three years immediately following the 1821 reorganization are proportional to the number of enlistees following the earlier reorganization. This suggests that those who remained had a significant amount of time left in their enlistment, as it was not until 1823 that a relatively large number of recruits (136) were required.

In contrast to the periods following military reduction, 1819 and 1820 were marked by an exceptionally large number of recruits who sought military service and enlisted in the Seventh Infantry. Again, a closer look at

national economic events reveal that the young United States was experiencing its first economic depression during this period. In a time when jobs were scarce both in the cities and in rural settings, the military provided an ideal source of food, clothing and shelter, along with a minimal monthly wage.[20] Additionally, the sixteen dollar bounty offered to new recruits was undoubtedly a sufficient catalyst for enlistment, as for those with little or no money, sixteen dollars represented a significant sum. This becomes especially relevant in considering the large number of deserters in both of those years, a subject which will be discussed in more detail later (Table 2.10).[21]

When a man joined the army, he provided the enlisting officer with four important pieces of information: his name, age, place of birth and occupation prior to enlistment. A study of these characteristics for members of the Seventh Infantry, when coupled with information concerning how, when and under what conditions the individual left the regiment, prompts a number of questions which are the primary focus of this work: Who were the Cottonbalers, what prompted them to enlist, and why did they leave the army?

Seeking enlistment in the army, a soldier first gave his name to the recruiting officer. For most, this was a straightforward matter. However, some who enlisted saw the need to conceal their identity, and therefore gave an alias. Edward Coffman notes that America's most famous enlisted man of the period, Edgar Allen Poe, adopted the name Edgar Allen Perry when he enlisted in May 1827, hoping to escape the difficulties at school and at home which plagued him. It can be assumed that many others followed this practice as well, as Coffman asserts that the army provided a means by which

young men could either vanish, or escape from whatever problems confronted them.[22]

The second piece of information given to the recruiting officer was the soldier's age. The "General Rules and Regulations of 1813," by which the army was administered, was explicit as to age and physical well-being of recruits. Despite minor revisions in 1815, 1821 and 1825, the regulations by which the army was directed between 1815 and 1830 specified that "All free male persons, above eighteen, and under thirty-five years of age, who are active, able bodied, and free from disease, may be enlisted."[23]

Scholars of earlier American wars have asserted that prior to the War of 1812 American armies were composed of men drawn from the younger generations of American society. In contrast, it has been observed that nearly half of those enlistees who joined during the War of 1812 were over the age of twenty-five.[24] The Seventh Infantry continued to follow this later pattern for the next fifteen years. While there were a substantial number of young men who enlisted in the army between 1815 and 1830, the vast majority of those who enlisted were above the age of twenty five, a time in life when most men were becoming established in their respective vocations.

Some differences appear when the ages of native-born and foreign-born enlistees are compared. On the whole, foreign-born enlistees were older than native-born enlistees. No primary accounts exist which explain this difference, and hence it is difficult to make any concrete assumptions from this information alone, as undoubtedly the recruits had many varied motives for enlistment. Nonetheless, if one compares the mean age of native-born and foreign-born recruits, the statistics suggest that for foreign-

born enlistees, some reorientation may have been necessary upon arrival in the United States, or they had to experience failure at other endeavors, before turning to the army, as has been noted by other scholars of the period.[25]

Although most enlistees, both native and foreign-born, were not young men, the regulations did dictate that a significant number of "healthy active" boys between the ages of fourteen and eighteen were to be recruited by the army to serve as musicians. In any case, those recruits who were under the age of eighteen had to have a form of consent provided by a parent, guardian, or master, as was repeatedly dictated in the general regulations.[26] Despite these regulations, some of those who were underage nonetheless sought enlistment, often lying about their age to enlist despite their status as a minor.

One such enlistee was Charles Martin Gray. At the outset of the War of 1812, Gray possessed "the most ardent thirst for distinction as a soldier, as well as a natural love for the exciting adventures of a soldier's life," which motivated him to seek military service, despite the fact that he was still a thirteen year old apprentice to a fancy chair maker. Having unsuccessfully sought to join a militia unit in 1813, he attempted to enlist in the regular army two years later. His attempt was foiled by his father, who "by virtue of his parental authority . . . sued out a writ of habeas corpus against Major Jacob Dinkins, and having returned his enlistment bounty, demanded and obtained his truant son, on the grounds that he was a minor, and under the proper military age."[27] At nineteen, Gray, having finally come of age, enlisted. In 1858, his account of ten years of service in company A of the Seventh Infantry was published, a record which provides great insight into the life and motivations of the enlisted man of the army during this period.

From the second element of information provided by the enlistees, it is possible to determine which if any region of the United States supplied the most recruits to the Seventh Infantry, as well as how many enlistees were in fact Latrobe's "worthless German, English or Irish immigrants." Most recruits from the United States gave both city and state of birth, although some were not as specific. Foreign-born recruits offered the same type of information, listing both the country, and county, city, or province in which they were born, though as was the case with the Americans, some were not as explicit as to their origin.

It becomes apparent that during this time, the vast majority of the recruits--from a low of 70.3 percent in 1820 to a high of 95.7 percent in 1826--were native-born Americans (Table 2.4). Most of these men were from the Mid-Atlantic states (New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania), while representation from New England and the southern states was less pronounced. The representatives from the Old Northwest (Indiana, Ohio and Michigan) and the central states (Tennessee, Kentucky and Missouri), were present in even smaller quantities, although the representation from these areas in the Seventh Infantry did increase as time progressed. These regional trends closely correspond with the populations for these areas which were published in the 1820 and 1830 censuses. However, with respect to regionalism, the years which encompass the panic of 1819 deserve special attention.

It has been established that a great number of recruits joined both the army and the Seventh Infantry during the economic depression of 1819-20. Examining the statistics provided in Table 2.5 for those two years reveals that during that period, the vast majority of recruits were from the Mid-Atlantic

states, with the state of Maryland following closely behind. While this would appear unremarkable, the fact that in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York over 50,000 people were without jobs, the high numbers of enlistments take on special significance, as they suggest that during times of economic troubles, the army became a haven for the depressed element of society, a trend which will be tested further during 1837 and 1857.[28]

In comparison to their American-born comrades-in-arms, foreign-born recruits only composed approximately 20 percent of the enlistees. Aside for the brief period between 1825 and 1828 when the General Regulations dictated that "No foreigner shall be enlisted in the army without special permission from general headquarters," the number of foreign-born enlistees was relatively constant (Table 2.6). Nonetheless, there were a number of foreigners who enlisted between 1826 and 1827, ostensibly by the graces of general headquarters. However, the dramatic decrease in the total number of recruits for the entire army necessitated the elimination of this practice, and the next year, the stipulation was dropped, and men were enlisted regardless of national origin.[29]

Since the American Revolution, forty years of on-again, off-again wars around the Atlantic rim had slowed immigration from Europe to the United States to a trickle. By 1815, most ethnic groups who were already in America were assimilated into what had become a predominantly Anglo-American society, with those few who retained their European roots isolated in recognizably distinct island communities. Prior to 1850, no national statistics were published which allow for the comparison of foreign-born enlistees with the percentage of foreign-born individuals living in the United States. However, a comparison of the representatives of the different nationalities

allows for the determination of which had the greatest presence in the Seventh Infantry, a statistic which becomes important as a point of departure for later comparisons.[30]

In 1830, the Irish economy was sluggish, but nothing like the depths of the great potato famine which would shock the countryside over a decade later. Nonetheless, Ireland provided the greatest mass of immigrants who served in the American army between 1815 and 1830. The English-born recruits rated next to them, and while at one point representing 60 percent of the enlistees, this was in a year when there were only five foreign-born enlistees in the entire regiment. These enlistees were augmented by other nationalities, predominantly from western Europe, though rarely did their numbers equal or exceed those offered by the Irish and the English.[31]

On his enlistment contract, Charles Martin Gray listed his occupation as "laborer," that being the last fragment of information required of recruits upon enlistment during the ante-bellum period. Alexander de Tocqueville considered the army in a democratic nation as composed not of men who were "the wealthiest, the best educated, and the most able," but of men who, when considered collectively, form "a small nation by itself, where the mind is less enlarged, and habits are more rude than in the nation at large." Thus, it would appear that the rank and file of the American army would be composed predominantly of men similar to Gray: former apprentices, idle laborers, and unskilled and marginal men who turned to the army as a means of steady employment.[32] An evaluation of this information, when coupled with other data regarding age, desertion, and reenlistment, seriously questions the validity of the notion that the army and the Seventh Infantry served as a haven for the dregs of society between 1815 and 1830. Moreover,

an examination of the occupational structure of the Cottonbalers reveals a markedly different set of circumstances for native-born and foreign-born recruits.

An initial examination of the occupational structure of all recruits shows that in most cases, recruits in the Seventh were composed predominantly of skilled artisans of various kinds between 1818 and 1830, with the second most numerous occupation for any given year composed of either farmers or laborers (Table 2.7). Even in periods of national depression (1819 and 1820), artisans and skilled laborers represented a significant percentage of the Seventh Infantry (44.1 and 41.7 percent respectively), while laborers were fewer in number (16.5 and 25.5 percent).[33] Based upon this data alone, it would appear that despite some minor aberrations, many of those who enlisted in the army claimed to have some level of skill in the workplace. Contrary to de Tocqueville, it would appear that they were not men whose minds were "less enlarged" and lacked "habits were more rude," but were instead some sort skilled laborer or artisan, an important characteristic when considering the overall composition of any regiment.

This inclination becomes more pronounced when the occupations of native-born and foreign-born recruits are compared separately. For the greatest portion of the fifteen year span in question, American recruits displayed a pronounced tendency to have been previously employed as either artisans or farmers, with the percentage of laborers exceeding that of the farmers on only a few occasions, as is indicated in Table 2.8. Even in times of depression, which appear to have attracted both American seamen and men with prior military experience to the ranks, artisan remained the occupation with the greatest representation, signifying the presence of men

with at least some substantial occupation, not simply laborers and n'er do wells.

In contrast, Table 2.9 shows that the occupational trends of foreign-born enlistees are much less pronounced. Apart from laborers who seem to be represented whenever there were more than fifty foreign-born enlistees, no other occupational groups are either dominant, or appear to fall into any discernible pattern. While the supposition that the lack of any traceable occupational representation on the part of non-native enlistees indicates that immigrants sought the army only because it offered a sure means of employment in their new country can be made, an hypothesis of that nature would definitely need supporting evidence which at this point is not forthcoming.

With much of the "who," and a large portion of the "why" established as to what types of men would join the army, it is necessary to turn to what motivated them while they were in the service based upon the last element of significant information provided by the register of enlistment: how the soldier concluded his term of service. Between 1815 and 1830, a term of enlistment in the army was for five years duration. For enlistees in the Seventh Infantry, those years were spent pursuing Seminole Indians across north central Florida and providing a show of force along the southern border of the United States, constructing forts and roads in Louisiana or western Arkansas, or garrisoning lonely posts on the southwestern frontier, mediating disputes between various Indian tribes. In any case, the end of a soldier's enlistment came primarily in one of four forms: death (from combat, illness, disease, or injury), desertion, reenlistment, or discharge in one form or another. From this evidence, it is possible to determine what

may have motivated many of these to remain in the service, as well as examine those methods by which men sought escape from the regimentation of army life, statistics which are summarized in Table 2.10.

Between 1815 and 1830, the Seventh Infantry, aside from the concluding actions of the War of 1812 in the New Orleans campaign, saw little combat, with the vast majority of its time consumed by garrison duty at Forts Gadsden, Scott, or Gaines (respectively on the Appalachicola, Flint, and Chattahoochee rivers), or at Forts Jesup, Smith and Gibson, as well as other satellite posts on the southwestern frontier. During the entire period, there was only one combat casualty suffered by those who enlisted between 1815 and 1830, with the remaining deaths due to hostile action suffered by men who enlisted prior to 1815. With that being the case, it is fairly easy to determine the circumstances of the death of Sergeant Frederick McIntosh, as his death, and the deaths of 40 other men and women in November of 1817, was a significant event during the First Seminole War.

Following the reorganization of 1815, the new Seventh Infantry was ordered to Fort Scott, Georgia, on the Appalachicola River. Under the overall command of Brigadier General Edmund Pendleton Gaines, the regiment was to not only guard the border, but to provide a show of force to discourage renegade free blacks from launching raids across the border from the Negro Fort, the name of a former British post abandoned after the War of 1812. This post posed a serious threat to Fort Scott, as it was built along the banks of the Appalachicola River and, manned by these marauders, threatened the naval resupply route to Fort Scott from the Gulf of Mexico.[34]

On July 27, 1816, the Negro Fort was totally destroyed, blown to pieces when a hot cannon round, fired from American gunboats acting under

orders of General Gaines to reduce the stronghold, fortuitously scored a direct hit upon the post's powder magazine. This decreased the strength of the Seminole Indians in the region, as they were not only weakened numerically by the deaths of 300 Negro allies, but Creek warriors, allied with the Americans, were given the stores taken from Negro Fort (2,500 muskets, 50 carbines, 400 pistols, and 500 swords salvaged from the ruins ), weapons which dramatically upset the balance of power among the rival tribes. For the next year, minor border incidents occurred. These culminated in the expedition of 250 men of the Seventh Infantry, led by Major David E. Twiggs, to arrest Neamathla, chief of the Mikasuki branch of the Seminole tribe, who had threatened all Americans who attempted to cross the Flint River into Spanish Florida. Although the ensuing skirmish outside of Neamathla's village of Fowltown on November 21, 1817, did not result in any American casualties, the Indians soon retaliated.[35]

In mid-November, 1817, a detachment of forty men, under the command of Lieutenant Richard W. Scott of the Seventh was detailed southward to Fort Gadsden to assist in the guiding of three boats of supplies upriver to the latter post. After completing this duty, they returned, bearing a portion of the regiment's clothing for the next year, as well as seven soldiers' wives. On November 30, they were ambushed on the river by some 500 Indians, who killed all the women and but six of the soldiers. One of the soldiers killed was Sergeant Frederick McIntosh, the only member of the Seventh Infantry who enlisted between 1815 and 1830 to be killed in action.[36]

However, that is not to say that all encounters with the Indians resulted in casualties, for Charles Martin Gray offers another episode of Indian-American conflict on the southwestern frontier which did not result

in combat fatalities. In August 1821, while the threat of hostile Indians still loomed large in the Florida panhandle, Private Gray was selected to carry important dispatches through sixty miles of the "Indian Nation." Gray considered this a difficult mission, as an Irish private who was initially assigned the duty set off a day earlier, only to return, "bare-headed, bare-footed, and almost entirely bare all over," after a few hours absence, having been attacked by Indians just a short distance down the trail.

Nonetheless, the intrepid Private Gray, with his "haversack of papers" and "rusty firelock," set off on the journey from Fort Gadsden to Fort Scott, "with the full purpose of accomplishing my journey, whatever might betide me." After covering almost half the distance, he chanced upon a Seminole, and the description of what ensued is best described by Gray himself:

> I was suddenly confronted, right in my way, by a tall, stalwart savage, painted and bedizened in all manner of shapes and forms, and representing all manner of things terrible and destructive. Of course there was no friendly greeting between the two strangers. On the contrary, their guns were brought to their soldiers, as quick as thought, and simultaneously discharged. Each combatant then took to a tree, and the firing continued for three or four rounds, as one or the other exposed any part of his person, until, after having become a little composed, I recollected some words I casually heard from General [Andrew] Jackson, and after having loaded my musket, adroitly displayed a good portion of my hat upon the ramrod, whilst I fixed my bayonet, received the shot of my adversary in my hat, and then charged upon him like lightning. The robber, for such he was, then disappeared into the neighboring swamp, and I made progress towards Fort Scott, not in "the common time," nor "in the quick step," nor in the "double quick," but in the quickest step perhaps that any man, on this side of the broad Atlantic, ever employed to annihilate space and distance.

Gray safely arrived at Fort Scott, and upon report to Brevet Brigadier General Matthew Arbuckle, commanding officer of the Seventh Infantry, detailed

him back to Fort Gadsden, where he and the remainder of his company soon departed en route to their new post in Arkansas Territory.[37]

Not all of the deaths which occurred in the army were the result of action by a hostile enemy. Between 1815 and 1830, over 200 enlistees in the Seventh Infantry died as a result of illness, disease, drowning or exposure. The bulk of those who died did so when the regiment was stationed at Forts Gadsden and Scott in 1820 and 1821. The latter post was so unhealthy, the regimental surgeon and later Surgeon General Thomas Lawson wrote of it:

> Nor was death much less busy at this place. As soon as cold weather commenced . . . all diseases exhibited new complications and more fatal results . . . for days, for weeks, nay longer, would one of these poor creatures stagger under the burden of intermittent fever, dropsy, and scurvy combined when the diarrhea also coming on him, he necessarily sank under the accumulated weight of the disease.[38]

However, the regiment did not escape these problems by simply moving westward, as once the regiment established Fort Gibson in 1824, the death rate began to increase again. Even at this early stage, it appeared that Fort Gibson was well on its way of earning its reputation as "that charnal-house [sic] of the Army."[39] On the surface, it would simply appear that some posts were simply more unhealthy than others. However, when the death rate is compared with the desertion rate, these numbers take on increased significance.

Throughout the antebellum period, desertion was a problem which continually plagued the army. Based upon unpublished army records, it has been estimated that between 1821 and 1830, over 6,500 men deserted from the ranks of the United States Army for at least some portion of their term of service. Although these records do not include those who may have

deserted during the 1819-20 economic depression, they nonetheless represent nearly one fourth of the estimated 15,000 men who enlisted during the same period. Many of these deserters were apprehended and punished, serving not only the remainder of their term, but also making up the time that they were absent. This was often done under punishment, usually at hard labor with ball and chain. However, many more did not return, and the money spent on these men by the army and never recovered was an over-riding concern for military officials and politicians. Based upon a study conducted by the War Department in 1830, the over 5,600 men who deserted between 1823 and 1829 cost the army an estimated $471,263, a large sum by any standard. Hoping to enact legislation to prevent "men of intemperate habits and of dissolute character" from enlisting in the army, suggestions were offered ranging from eliminating the daily whiskey ration and enlistment bounty, to improving promotion from the ranks, but none of these changes took place before 1830. As a result, desertion continued to be a problem.[40]

The Seventh Infantry was certainly not immune to the difficulties of desertion, though the percentage of deserters from this regiment was much lower than the army as a whole. Between 1815 and 1830, over 500 men, or just under 8 percent of the total enlistees in the regiment deserted at least once during their time in uniform. Desertion statistics compiled from the registers of enlistments showed both when a soldier deserted, as well as when during his term he left the army, and fell into readily recognizable patterns, which are easily explained when national economic trends, location of the regiment at that place and time, death rate in the regiment during the period, and the character of the enlistees are considered.

A large number of desertions occurred between 1819 and 1820. As was the case with enlistments, many men undoubtedly sought to leave the military during the panic of 1819 and the ensuing depression. While this might seem contradictory, as men were both enlisting and deserting during the same time, when the sixteen dollars bounty paid to all new recruits upon enlistment is considered, it would appear that many of the newcomers to the army signed on, received their bonuses, then deserted, a notion corroborated by an analysis of the length of time in service prior to desertion.

National economic condition was not the only factor which influenced desertion. While the depression serves as a plausible explanation for desertion between 1819, 1820, and 1821 it is also necessary to consider the death rate of the regiment for the same period. Even when the forty men who were killed in North Florida in 1817 are considered (who do not appear on Table 2.10 because most enlisted prior to 1815), it would appear that where the regiment was posted was not without its influence, for as the death rate increased, so did the rate of desertion. This is best illustrated in 1820 and 1821, as well as in the period following the regiment's arrival in Arkansas Territory.

In 1824, a significant portion of the regiment was moved westward from Fort Smith, Arkansas, to establish a new post at the confluence of the Grand and Neosho rivers.[41] Over the next six years, desertion rate steadily increased, from the low of 6 desertions (0.1 percent) in 1822, when the regiment was en route from north Florida to Fort Smith by way of New Orleans, to a high of 16 percent in 1830, when the Cottonbalers formed the garrison at Fort Gibson. It would appear that Gibson, the headquarters for all American troops on the southwestern frontier, and Fort Towson, established

by the Seventh on the military road, approximately 75 miles south of Fort Gibson, were neither the most desirable, nor the most healthy of posts for the enlisted men, and men actively sought escape from the confines of both. Between 1824 and 1830, numerous advertisements in the Arkansas Gazette offered as much as $120.00 for "the apprehension and delivery of . . . deserters, at this post [Fort Gibson], or to any officer in the U.S. Army," and most of the descriptions noted that these men were formerly of the Seventh Infantry.[42]

When soldiers deserted during their term of service, most had the tendency to leave shortly after the beginning of their term of service, with the rate of desertion steadily declining as his length of service in the regiment increased, a trend illustrated in Table 2.11. This propensity for early desertion adheres closely to the statistics published by the War Department in 1826, in a comprehensive examination of the desertion problem for the three years ending in September 1825. The report to Congress showed that nearly half of those who deserted between 1823 and 1825 (1,142 of 2,541) deserted during the first year of service, while the number of deserters in subsequent years of service steadily declined (235 in second year, 140 in the third year, 81 in the fourth and the remaining 66 in the fifth). These statistics also show that 1,121 of the 2,541, or nearly 44 percent, of those who deserted were between the ages of 21 and 30. Based upon the age at desertion of members of the Seventh Infantry, it would seem that there was a tendency for younger men to desert more readily than older men. However, apart from the statistical evaluation of the entire army, it is difficult to determine if these trends are applicable to the greater whole.[43]

As is the case for other factors, the recollections of Private Gray provide some insight as to why men might have deserted during the first weeks of service, as well as why men might have deserted later during their military career. After enlisting in the army in April of 1819 and making his way to the regimental rendezvous (at the time near Fort Hawkins, Georgia), Gray recalled how he felt after his first few days in uniform; "The first night found me a little jaded, the second a little sore, the third, a little tired and sore, the fourth, quite weary, the fifth, a little sick, the sixth . . . not only weary, sick and sore, but utterly disgusted with the music of the drum and heartily adverse to the grandest warlike achievements of history, and to the very name of the soldier itself." With these words, it is possible to theorize why many soldiers who deserted from the army might have left after only a few days in uniform. This is even more significant considering that at the time, Gray was still a young man, as most of the deserters from the Seventh Infantry were under the age of twenty five. However, Gray is not to be placed among this class of men, for in the days which followed, he displayed more fortitude than many of his comrades in arms, for he added, "This depression, and this feeling of gloom and despondency, however, were only temporary, and a few days rest and recreation found me again on my legs, recuperated in spirits, and just as full of fun, vivacity, and deviltry, as on the day of my first enlistment, under the glorious banner of the 'Stars and Stripes.'"[44] This propensity for desertion seemed to affect younger men more than older men, as more deserted at a younger age than did at an older age (see Table 2.12).

That is not to say that all soldiers who were able to overcome the element of shock following the first days in uniform served their complete term. Although less than 40 percent deserted after the first term of service,

many of those who initially deserted either returned to serve the remainder of their term, were apprehended and served the remainder of their term either under confinement or at forced labor, or simply returned to their post after a few days and were punished, only to desert again at a later date. On the whole, it is difficult to calculate the motivation for multiple desertions, as less than 10 percent of the enlistees in the Seventh Infantry practiced this behavior (Table 2.13).

In spite of this examination of desertion statistics, that is not to say that all enlisted men sought escape from the army by simply running away. Along with desertion, alcohol formed the greatest social ill which confronted the Seventh not only between 1815 and 1830, but for the greater portion of the nineteenth century as well. Commented upon by a number of foreign observers, it was this problem which led many to believe that "habits of intemperance were very common in the American army," as was the opinion of a number of English travelers in the country.[45] Such a characterization would appear to be substantiated by the recollections of Charles Martin Gray, for on more than one or two occasions, he sought to obtain alcohol to "allay the burning thirst of myself and my companions for that medicine of the soul, which supplies us with strengths to combat the difficulties in our way, to surmount the common trials of humanity, and to raise us o'er the ills of life victorious.'" He went to great lengths to obtain the "old Rye and Monongahela," often crafting devious schemes or perpetuating grand charades in order to satisfy his spirituous desires.[46]

One such occasion is particularly memorable. Hoping to purchase whiskey from the sutler, who had brought his supply of alcohol to the post at which Gray was stationed, Gray, prior to making the transaction, thought to

hide two identical bottles, one empty, the other full of water, in his greatcoat, which had been "supplied with several more than the usual number of pockets." He approached the sutler, gave him the empty bottle, and requested him to fill it. This the purveyor did, and the bottle was carefully stored away in one of the pockets. Lacking any money, Gray's "genius then supplied the place of gold and silver," in his efforts to slake his thirst. The penniless private begged for credit from the sutler, and when none was forthcoming, Gray was requested to return the bottle of whiskey. Apparently satisfying the sutler's demands, he returned the bottle of water and sadly watched its contents disappear as the bottle was emptied into the cask owned by "the incorrigible John Cosby, Esq." However, it was Gray who got the last laugh. Unbeknownst to the sutler, the dexterous private had switched the two bottles in the presence of the sutler, and a bottle of water was poured into the cask while the bottle of liquor was safely hidden in the pockets of Private Gray's greatcoat. In that manner, Gray reportedly duped several individuals, until his manner of trickery was discovered. It went without punishment, as it "was deemed so capital a joke, all the good-hearted dealers seemed to approve than condemn his pious fraud.'"[47]

Gray's antics undoubtedly provided a light-hearted diversion to the every-day drudgery of military service, building roads and isolated outposts on the frontier. Many men sought to escape military service as soon as possible, and if they did not die from illness or from combat, then they sought an escape willfully by desertion, or mentally through consumption of alcohol. However, most did so simply by eagerly anticipating the day when their term of service expired. The vast majority of those who enlisted in the army and in the Seventh Infantry simply served one term, were mustered

out, and returned to civilian life. However, it is nearly impossible to determine the actions of these individuals after their term of service expired, as most simply returned to society, and to trace their later days would necessitate the examination of census records and local histories on a case-by-case basis. Thus, it is necessary to assume that most were not unlike Charles Gray, who, upon the conclusion of his second term of enlistment, was honorably discharged, and simply returned home to South Carolina.[48]

However, caution must be exercised so as not to overlook those individuals who served multiple terms, for a number of men did in fact remain in the military after the conclusion of their first term of service. While it is impossible to determine the reenlistment rate prior to 1820, as those individuals who would have reenlisted during this period enlisted prior to 1815, most of the men who elected to remain in the army after their first period of enlistment expired did so after 1827. It would appear that combat service, either in the War of 1812 or in the First Seminole War, was a discouraging factor when reenlistment is concerned, as most of those who elected to stay in the army were from recruiting groups who came into service after combat in these conflicts were over (Table 2.10). While these findings are speculative with respect to the influences of combat, these numbers, as was the case with the percentages of foreign-born enlistees, provide a reference point by similar effects can be tested after the Second Seminole War and the Mexican War.

The age and occupations of the reenlistees are interesting as well, for these numbers exhibit some interesting characteristics (Tables 2.14 and 2.15). Only 25 percent of those who reenlisted listed their occupation as soldier, despite having served in the army for five years. To make any definite

statements regarding these trends forces reliance upon supposition. However, it appears that the number of men who looked to the military as a career choice was very small, a testament to the fact that the opportunity of ever rising above the rank of a senior noncommissioned officer was all but nonexistent.[49] Nonetheless, based upon the ages of the men who did reenlist, it would appear that those men who joined at a younger age (between 21 and 24), like Charles Martin Gray, who signed up for a second term in 1824 at the age of 24, had a higher tendency to reenlist than did those who were a few years older. The fact that relatively few men over the age of 33 reenlisted suggests that by at age, men had settled down and were prepared to assume a more stable position in society.

In December of 1830, the Seventh Infantry was divided between Forts Gibson and Jesup, two posts on the Southwestern frontier, which guarded the approaches to Spanish Texas. Upon arrival in the West, they fulfilled a necessary role in maintaining peace between rival Indian tribes in the area, enforcing a number of treaties signed between 1824 and 1830. Since 1825, the Seventh, and more importantly, the enlisted men of the regiment, assumed responsibility for the construction of numerous garrisons and roads in the region, erecting not only both posts at which they were presently stationed, but two others, as well as roads which connected Fort Gibson with Fort Smith and Fort Smith with Fort Towson 1825 and 1826.

Throughout this period, enlisted men constantly came and went as the commanding officers of the regiment, Colonel James McDonald, Colonel David Brearly, and Brevet Brigadier General Matthew Arbuckle (who commanded the Seventh for over thirty years) sought recruits to maintain the strength of the regiment. Based upon a study of the condition, origin,

and occupational status of the men who joined the regiment between 1815 and 1830, it is possible to conclude that during this period, most of those who enlisted did so from a variety of social and economic factors. It appears that those who enlisted were neither "the scum of the population of the older states," nor the "worthless German, English or Irish immigrants," as the permanently disadvantaged, the young, the destitute, and the unfortunate immigrant were not present in significant numbers, the exception being during periods of national economic depression

To put aside the notion of the army having contained the refuse of American society, both foreign and native-born, necessitates the acceptance of another notion, which has been substantiated by the information thus presented. For all intents and purposes, it appears that most enlistees in the Seventh Infantry between 1815 and 1830, with the exception of the short period marred by the Panic of 1819, were American men of respectable social status who came from the settled regions of the country. As most only served for five years, it is difficult to say that these men chose the military as a profession, for with the exception of a very small number of men, most undoubtedly found the conditions of army life difficult, if not deadly, and returned to the civilian population upon the conclusion of their enlistment. While for a short fifteen year span, such a conclusion might seem unremarkable, it nonetheless serves as a point of departure for examining the Seventh Regiment of Infantry over the next thirty years.

Notes

Chapter 2

1. General Andrew Jackson to Secretary of War James Monroe, 9 January 1815, in John Spencer Bassett, Correspondence of Andrew Jackson, 7 vols. (Washington, DC: Carnegie Institute of DC, 1927), 2: 136-138.

2. For a detailed account of the New Orleans campaigns, see Robin Reilly, The British at the Gates: The New Orleans Campaign in the War of 1812, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1974) and Frank L. Owsley, Struggle for the Gulf Borderlands: The Creek War and the Battle of New Orleans, 1812-1815 (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1981).

3. History of the "Cottonbalers" 7th Infantry Regiment (Baton Rouge: Army and Navy Publishing Co., 1956), 6.

4. For a discussion of the careers of these individuals, consult Robert Remini, Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), Jack Bauer, Zachary Taylor, Soldier, Planter, Statesman of the Old Southwest (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), and Holman Hamilton, Zachary Taylor: Soldier of the Republic, (New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1941). Campaigns in which the Seventh was involved are discussed in detail in Owsley, Struggle for the Gulf Borderlands, and John K. Mahon, The Second Seminole War, 2d ed. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1967), while the role of the regiment at frontier military posts has been considered in Edwin Bearss and Arrell M. Gibson, Fort Smith: Little Gibraltar on the Arkansas (Norman: University of

Oklahoma Press, 1969), and Brad Agnew, Fort Gibson, Terminal on the Trail of Tears, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980).

5. Francis Paul Prucha, Sword of the Republic: The United States Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846 (New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprint, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 119.

6. For a complete discussion of the "Era of Reform," see William Skelton, An American Profession of Arms: The Army Officer Corps, 1784-1861 (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1992), 109-130. Skelton argues that this period was crucial in the development of American military professionalism. Following the reorganization of 1815, a core of young, visionaries composed the army's officer corps, allowing for the embracing of new ideas. While these officers were primarily responsible for the maintenance of a peacetime army, always ready to face a threat from outside the United States, they should also be credited for developing an intellectual approach to the military art. "Military Preparedness" did not necessarily denote the maintenance of force, but also the insight to utilize such a force in the most effective means possible.

7. "An Act Fixing the Military Peace Establishment of the United States," 17 May 1815, in John F. Callan, Military Laws of the United States, Relating to the Army, Volunteers, Militia, and to Bounty Lands and Pensions, from the Foundation of the Government to 3 March, 1863 (Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1863), 266; James Madison to William B. Giles, 22 February 1815 in Benjamin Franklin Cooling, ed., The New American State Papers, vol.1: Policy and Strategy of National Defense (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1979), 1: 78.

8. "An Act Fixing the Military Establishment of the United States," Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 266.

9. William Addleman Ganoe, The History of the United States Army (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1924), 147.

10. Frederick B. Shaw, 140 Years of Service in Peace and War: The History of the Second Infantry, U.S. Army (Detroit: Strathmore Press, 1930), 205.

11. Ibid.; U.S. Department of the Army, The Army Lineage Book-Infantry (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1953), 224; and Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903), 221, 662.

12. Department of the Army, Army Lineage, 223.

13. J.C.A. Stagg, "Enlisted Men in the United States Army, 1812-1815: A Preliminary Survey," William and Mary Quarterly, 43 (October 1986), 621, 644-45.

14. Charles Royster, A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and the American Character, 1775-1783 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 25.

15. Charles Joseph Latrobe, The Rambler in North America, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1835), 2: 231; Francis Paul Prucha, "The United States Army as Viewed by British Travelers, 1825-1860," Military Affairs, 17 (Fall, 1953), 115.

16. U.S. Congress, American State Papers: Military Affairs 7 vols. (Washington, DC: Gales and Seaton, 1832-61) 1: 432-33; Anderson Chenault Quisenberry, Kentucky in the War of 1812 (Frankfort: Kentucky Historical Society, 1915), 158-162; Raphael P. Thian, Notes Illustrating the Military

Geography of the United States, 1813-1880 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1881), 33.

17. U.S. Congress, ASP: MA, 1: 432-33, 2: 261-262.

18. General Regulations for the Army, 1825, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1825), 352.

19. See Emory Upton, The Military Policy of the United States (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1912; reprint, New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 149-155, for the complete details of this reduction.

20. For a discussion of the Panic of 1819, see Charles Sellers, The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 137, and Murray Rothbard, The Panic of 1819: Reactions and Policies (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), which offers a detailed study of the policies which caused the economic panic, as well as the recovery efforts which were attempted by the government.

21. U.S., ASP: MA, 1: 432-33. During the War of 1812, the bounty for recruits reached as high as $124.00, though it was reduced at the war's end to $16.00, and again in 1821 to $12.00.

22. Edward M. Coffman, The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 145. Additional primary documents would shed some light as to how many recruits taken in by the Seventh followed this practice, but at this time, none are forthcoming, and it is necessary to assume that the majority of those who enlisted did so under what was their real name.

23. U.S., ASP: MA, 1: 432-433, 2: 261-262; General Regulations for the Army, 1825, 352.

24. See, for example, Harold Selesky, War and Society in Colonial Connecticut (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 172-173; Edward Papenfuse and Gregory Stiverson, "General Smallwood's Recruits," William and Mary Quarterly, 30 ( January 1973), 120-121; Mark Edward Lender ,"The Social Structure of the New Jersey Brigade: The Continental Line as a Standing Army," chap. in Peter Karsten, ed. The Military in America: From the Colonial Era to the Present (New York: Free Press, 1981), 29; Stagg, "Enlisted Men," 632-33.

25. Coffman, The Old Army, 142-144.

26. U.S., ASP: MA, 1: 432, 2: 621.

27. Charles Martin Gray, The Old Soldier's Story (Edgefield, SC..: Edgefield Advertiser Printing, 1868), 7-8.

28. Sellers, The Market Revolution, 137.

29. General Regulations for the Army, 1825, Art. 74, Par. 1287, quoted in Francis Paul Prucha, The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army and the Frontier, 1783-1846 (New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprint, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 327.

30. See Roland Berthoff, An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 148-149; U.S. Department of Commerce, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1960), 9-11.

31. Berthoff, An Unsettled People, 155.

32. Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, trans. by Henry Reeve, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1862), 2: 321.

33. For convenience, the category of artisan was created by grouping together over 70 different occupations, all of which represented some level of skilled labor.

34. Mahon, Second Seminole War, 23.

35. Ibid.

36. U.S., ASP: MA, 1: 687.

37. Gray, Old Soldier's Story, 40.

38. Thomas Lawson, Statistical report on the Sickness and Mortality of the Army of the United States, Compiled from the Records of the Surgeon General's Office-Embracing a Period of Twenty Years, from January 1819, to January 1839 (Washington, DC, 1840), quoted in Coffman, The Old Army, 184.

39. Army and Navy Chronicle 2 (12 May 1836), 295.

40. U.S., ASP: MA, IV: 284-287.

41. Agnew, Fort Gibson, 29; Regimental returns, Seventh Regiment of Infantry, National Archives, Record Group 94, Microcopy 665, roll 77, March, 1824.

42. Arkansas Gazette, 27 June 1826, 3:1

43. U.S., ASP: MA, : 3: 193-199, 274-277.

44. Gray, Old Soldier's Story, 13.

45. Francis Paul Prucha, "The American Army as viewed by British Travelers, 1825-1860," Military Affairs 17 (Fall 1953), 115-118.

46. Gray, Old Soldier's Story, 22.

47. Ibid., 21-22

48. Ibid., 60-61.

49. In Rankers: The Odyssey of the Enlisted Regular Soldier of America and Britain (New York: Greenberg Publishing Co., 1950), John Joseph Lenney notes that between 1815 and 1836, only 12 enlisted men were promoted from the ranks to officer status, with the vast majority of officer commissions being awarded to either graduates of the military academy or to civilians, many of whom had prior military service (101,133).

## CHAPTER III

## THE "PROBLEM" OF THE INDIAN: 1831-1844

> "The position of the . . . Seventh Regiment is favorable to the affording of facilities to the Indians emigrating, under the provisions of the Acts of Congress, to the country marked out for them west of the boundary of the Territory of Arkansas . . . The troops there stationed will, by their presence and force, exert a beneficial influence over the conduct of the various tribes, and be instrumental in maintaining harmony and peace among them."
>
> -Commanding General Alexander Macomb
> November 1831[1]

General Macomb offered this view of the garrisons of Fort Gibson and Fort Towson shortly after the passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830, which represented the culmination of over fifteen years of debate on what to do with the Native American population in the Southeast. This law, formally referred to as, "An Act to Provide for the Removal of the Indian Tribes within any of the States and Territories and for their Permanent Settlement west of the River Mississippi," provided for "the voluntary removal of Native Americans" from their tribal lands in the southeastern United States to new lands in Indian territory.[2] Over the course of the next twelve years, approximately 60,000 Indians from the Cherokee, Choctaw, Creek, Chickasaw, and Seminole tribes were removed from their ancestral lands and relocated to lands west of the Mississippi.[3]

Although the Seventh Regiment was stationed in western Arkansas eight years earlier, the passage of the Indian Removal Act in May 1830 greatly changed the regiment's role in the area, not to mention the population of

the region. With the introduction of great numbers of Native Americans into the western territory, the Seventh Infantry's heretofore relatively simple duties of road building and frontier defense were compounded with more difficult tasks.[4] For the next eleven years (1831-1842), the Seventh Infantry was directly involved in the implementation of Indian policy in the old southwest, with the Second Seminole War "solving" the problem of the Indian in the lands east of the Mississippi River. Whether facilitating Indian removal, preventing warfare between rival tribes in western Arkansas, or preventing white incursion and illegal smuggling, the Seventh played an active role in lands west of the Mississippi soon designated as Indian Territory.[5] Although the lion's share of the regiment's duties between 1831 and 1839 were undertaken within the confines of that region, not all of the "problems" with the Indian were in the vicinity of Fort Gibson, as the regiment returned to Florida in 1839 to take part in a difficult war against the recalcitrant Seminole Indians, and remained there until 1844.

Within this complex web of Indian removal and inter-tribal conflict, the enlisted soldiers of the Seventh Infantry maintained a Spartan existence, as the men who bore the Cottonbaler name formed the garrison at a number of isolated log stockades on the far fringes of the western frontier. Although the entire regiment was posted at Fort Gibson for much of 1831 and 1832, from 1833 to 1844 all ten companies in the regiment were rarely together at one location. Between 1831 and 1844, the Seventh Infantry maintained, at one time or another, no less than 28 posts, first in Indian Territory, and then in Florida. Even the conclusion of the Seminole War did not result in the assembly of the entire regiment, as between 1842 and 1844 the Seventh Infantry manned Forts Pike, Brook, Fanning, Morgan, Wood, Pickens and

McRee, coastal fortifications along the Gulf of Mexico. Additionally, a company of the Seventh occupied the New Orleans Barracks, a short distance from the regiment's most distinguished military action to date.[6]

As discussed in the previous chapter, there were many changes in both the size and composition of the army during the fifteen years after the War of 1812, as politicians and the American people debated the size and purpose of the permanent military establishment. By 1831, those parties in dispute compromised, and the size and strength of the United States army remained essentially the same, with the exception of new units created in response to the expanding role of the army. Between 1831 and 1836, the only changes in the size of the peacetime military establishment were the addition of mounted forces, whose enhanced mobility allowed the army to more effectively fulfill its duties on the Great Plains. Three companies of the United States Mounted Ranger Battalion joined the Seventh at Fort Gibson to range the southwestern frontier in 1832. The next year this body of mounted troops, more akin to mounted militia than an organized army unit, was reorganized into the more militarily impressive First Dragoons.[7] In 1836, the Second Dragoons were authorized, and served with distinction in the era of the Seminole War, manning posts on the western frontier while many of the infantry regiments were otherwise occupied in Florida.[8] It was that conflict however, which necessitated the greatest increase in the professional military establishment as three years after the commencement of hostilities in Florida, the Secretary of War, in consultation with military commanders in Florida, realized that additional regular forces would be needed to wage the gradually escalating war of removal against the Seminole Indians.

Throughout the second half of the "thirty years' peace," recruitment in the United States Army continued under the basic provisions established in the General Regulations of 1820, which were revised in 1825, and again in 1832. Recruiting on both the national and the regimental level, enlistment officers actively sought new recruits. Article 82 of the General Regulations of 1832 clearly delineated who was to be considered for enlistment: "A recruit for the military service shall be an effective, able-bodied citizen of the United States, not less than five feet six inches high, and not less than eighteen years nor more than thirty-five years of age, and shall be engaged to serve for five years unless sooner discharged." [9]

The stipulations which prevented the enlistment of the foreign-born had been lifted in 1828, and foreign-born citizens formed a significant portion of the new enlistees recruited after that date.[10] The regulations concerning height and age were waived with respect to musicians and re-enlistees, and as before, all new recruits were given twelve dollar enlistment bounty, half paid when mustered into service and the other half paid when the recruit arrived at regimental headquarters.[11] Recruiting continued throughout the 1830's, though after the conclusion of the Second Seminole War, the General Recruiting Service was suspended for two years as the strength of the army was reduced.[12] Ultimately, slightly over two thousand men joined the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1844. They served in the regiment for terms of either three or five years, as a shorter period of enlistment was authorized between 1833 and 1838.[13]

As was the case with the men who joined the Seventh Infantry between 1815 and 1830, the enlistments between 1831 and 1844 can be easily linked with major national events, changes in military policy, role and

position. Moreover, the information they provided to recruiting officers at the time of their enlistment continues to provide an important data base from which it is possible to determine the composition of the men who enlisted in the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1844. Although it is possible to consider the enlistees on a year-by-year basis providing a detailed summary and analysis of the men who joined each year, the events which influenced enlistment in the regiment do not support the adoption of such a method. As a result, it is necessary to subdivide the enlistees who joined the Cottonbalers between 1831 and 1844 into four groups.

As related in the preceding chapter, those men who joined the regiment in the years immediately prior to the passage of the Indian Removal Act were overwhelmingly native-born recruits. With the exception of those who joined during the Panic of 1819, most enlistees were young men of a relatively respectable social position based solely upon their occupation, as based upon the information provided in the Registers of Enlistment, it is difficult to determine otherwise. Most enlistees between 1815 and 1830 only served for one five-year term, then returned to civilian life, lacking any desire for continued military service. It is reasonable to assume that many were not unlike Charles Martin Gray, though as a reenlistee, Gray represented a variation from the "typical" recruit.

In contrast, those who joined between 1831 and 1844 were markedly different with respect to age, occupation, and length of service than were their counterparts of the previous fifteen years. Affected by a variety of outside factors, the enlistees in the Seventh Infantry during the second half of the thirty years' peace were older and, based upon the information gleaned from their enlistment records, it is possible to conclude that some viewed the

military as a potential profession. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that a relatively large number of these individuals served multiple enlistments, with many remaining in the army for between six and ten years, and some much longer. Moreover, for a brief period during the Seminole War, the new enlistees were composed predominantly of the foreign-born, the first time native-born recruits did not form the majority of the new rank and file in the Seventh Infantry.

Despite these differences in the long-term, the enlistees of the early 1830s shared many of the same characteristics with respect to age, occupation, and place of origin with those who joined in the previous fifteen years. Those who joined at the beginning of the decade were predominantly native-born, with a heavy leavening of enlistees from New England and the Mid-Atlantic states--New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania--as is evident in Table 3.5. Foreign-born enlistees mostly hailed from Ireland, with English-born recruits following them in the greatest numbers (Table 3.6). During 1831, 1832, and 1833, the numbers of foreign-born enlistees are roughly proportional with the numbers of immigrants from Great Britain, Ireland and Germany. It is difficult, if not impossible to ascertain, whether the new enlistees are recent arrivals to the United States, or had been in the country from some period of time, as no references to this fact were made on their enlistment papers. For the Germans, however, the probability that these new recruits are recent immigrants is high, as 1832 marked the first year German immigrants began to arrive in the United States in significant numbers.[14]

From an occupational standpoint, the enlistees of the first three years of the decade are not easily categorized. When all recruits are considered, no

single occupational group dominates the ranks, as artisans, laborers, and soldiers were present in the highest reported percentages in 1831, 1832, and 1833, respectively. When native-born and foreign recruits are compared, however, a number of differences are apparent. Native-born recruits tended to be either artisans or laborers, although by the end of the period in question, soldiers were represented in significant numbers (Table 3.9). Foreign-born recruits displayed similar tendencies, though soldiers were not represented in large numbers, and laborers continued to dominate the ranks. With respect to non-native recruits, this trend persisted for the remainder of the period as laborers and artisans were most prevalent among the ranks of the foreign-born enlistee throughout the 1830s and first half of the 1840s. The era of the Seminole War was the only exception to this trend, as during those five years, soldiers were represented in the regiment in the greatest numbers.

Based upon these statistics, it is difficult to make any general statements with regard to the composition of recruits in the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1833. Aside for a brief period in 1832 when Chief Black Hawk and his minions threatened the upper Midwest, there was little prospect for combat service for American soldiers, and most could expect to serve without combat at a number of isolated frontier outposts, of which Forts Gibson and Coffee were representative examples. With the prospect of promotion from the ranks extremely limited, poor pay, harsh discipline and little or no provisions made for the continued sustenance of the soldier when he was discharged at the conclusion of his term of service, it would appear that the ranks of the Seventh Infantry were filled with individuals who were unable to find employment elsewhere. These factors, which

undoubtedly contributed to the high rate of desertion which will be discussed elsewhere in this chapter, gave rise to a need to improve the character of the rank and file, which at least to a degree, changed the composition of the regiment for a brief period of time.

Passed in March 1833, the "Act to Improve the Condition of the Non-commissioned Officers and Privates of the Army and Marine Corps of the United States and to Prevent Desertion," significantly changed not only the conditions, but also the term of service of soldiers in the army. This act reduced the term of enlistment to three years, increased the monthly salary of privates from five to six dollars, provided a reenlistment bounty of two months' pay, and at the same time restored whipping as a means of punishment for desertion during peacetime. Moreover, the act stipulated that one dollar would be deducted from the private's pay each month, with the accumulated sum to be paid at the time the individual was mustered out of the army, allowing a soldier to leave the service with a sum of no less than 36 dollars, a handsome amount by the standards of the day.[15]

Secretary of War Lewis Cass hoped that the passage of these provisions would result in "important meliorations in the character of the army," as he believed that "moral habits in the soldiery constitute one of the best safeguards against the abuse of military power."[16] General Macomb undoubtedly held a similar view, as he observed in late 1833 that "the men who now offer to enlist in the army are found to be of a more respectable class, and the number of enlistments does not diminish."[17] The comments of Commanding General Macomb take on additional significance when coupled with the enlistments in the Seventh Infantry for the same period, as the composition of the enlistees between 1834 and 1836 changed, with

desertions decreasing and reenlistments increasing. The year following the passage of these provisions, 255 new enlistees joined the Seventh Infantry, and these recruits undoubtedly hoped to capitalize upon the new terms of service offered by the army.

Those men who joined in 1834 were younger than those who had joined previously, though by 1836 the enlistees were the oldest of any recruiting class since 1815 (Table 3.3). Native-born and foreign-born recruits exhibited little difference in age, as the mean age for both groups was comparable. Neither American nor foreign-born citizens clearly dominated the ranks, though the number of native-born enlistees gradually increased, by 1836 outnumbering their foreign-born counterparts by nearly three to one.

While the majority of foreign-born citizens came from Germany and the Great Britain (England, Scotland and Ireland), the demography of native-born recruits changed somewhat between 1834 and 1836 (Tables 3.5 and 3.6). When all American enlistees are considered, those who listed their birthplace as New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey were in the majority. However, the second most populous group changed between 1834 and 1836, as by 1836 those who joined from the South and West increased and outnumbered enlistees from New England by three to one. Such a shift is abnormal, as one would expect New England to provide more recruits as land became scarce for later generations and young men had to find their livelihood elsewhere. However, any generalizations with respect to recruitment during his period are difficult to make, as little evidence exists to verify whether or not these changes are anything more than minor variations in regimental recruiting patterns.

Prior to 1834, no occupational group dominated the Cottonbalers newly mustered into service, and during the next three years those men who gave their occupation as soldier enlisted in unprecedented numbers (Table 3.7). The ranks of native-born enlistees particularly were filled with soldiers, but foreign-born recruits continued to lack a dominant occupational group. When all recruits are examined in each of the three years under consideration, soldiers not only enjoyed the greatest representation numerically, but the percentage of soldiers in the ranks increased over the three year period. At the same time, the percentage of all other occupational groups decreased. The idea of soldiers remaining in service will be explored elsewhere, as many of these men were undoubtedly re-enlistees. Moreover, the continued presence of soldiers in the ranks substantiates General Macomb's observation in 1833 that "further proof of the beneficial influence of the [Act of 1833] on the rank and file of the army is found in the fact that the soldiers who have honorably completed their term of service now more readily re-enlist."[18]

During the first half of the 1830's, the United States' economy was booming. The nation enjoyed substantial economic growth fostered by high cotton prices, the development of inter-regional waterways, and westward expansion.[19] The increased number of soldiers present in the ranks by 1836 appear to openly defy notions of prosperity in the "era of the common man." They do, however suggest that young men increasingly sought out the military after 1833, undoubtedly hoping to capitalize upon the reenlistment bonuses and accumulated wages to be paid when mustered out of service to elevate their position in society, exchanging a few years of military service for a journey westward, where they would assume the role of the

"frontiersman in blue." However, such notions are difficult, if not impossible to verify based solely upon enlistment records. Despite the potential for economic benefit at the conclusion of a three or five year term of service (based upon the accumulation of a portion of the monthly wage), it is difficult to determine whether or not these men were in fact career soldiers and identified themselves as such, or if lacking any other occupation, they simply listed soldier on their enlistment form. While analysis of payroll and census records could verify suppositions of relative prosperity at the conclusion of military service, no evidence to support this hypothesis is currently available. In either case, it must be remembered that there was an increased number of former soldiers in the ranks of the Seventh Infantry prior to 1837.

Throughout this period of economic growth, the Seventh Infantry remained at Fort Gibson, although numerous detachments were detailed to other locations along the southwestern frontier. From May through December of 1836, the majority of the regiment was moved to Camp Nacogdoches, Texas. There, the Seventh joined other elements of the United States Army under the command of General Edmund Pendleton Gaines ostensibly for "the defense of the Western Frontier of Louisiana. . . [and] for the preservation of neutrality as regards Texas and Mexico," while the Texas Revolution raged in Mexico's northernmost province.[20]

The prospect of wealth and glory lured many men to fight for Texas's independence during the revolution of 1835-1836. As a result, the Army of the Republic of Texas was filled with representatives of nearly every class of fortune-seeker: backwoodsmen, young southern planters, townsmen, and military deserters. Noah Smithwick, an early settler of Texas, recalled that a

number of United States army deserters fought in the Texas army at the battle of San Jacinto. Having left Gaines's command with the General's unspoken approval, they "deserted back" to the U.S. ranks once victory was in the hands of the Texans, and "no court martial ensued." However, Stephen Hardin noted that not all "deserted back" and during the summer of 1836, some two hundred were present in Nacogdoches, still wearing their issue uniforms, and refused to return to the United States. Despite these accounts which support the presence of former U.S. soldiers in the Army of the Republic of Texas, an exhaustive search of this organization's muster rolls reveals little evidence which shows that any members of the Seventh Infantry (former or otherwise) fought in the Texas Revolution.[21]

Brevet Brigadier General Matthew Arbuckle, recognizing that there "was no adequate cause for any longer maintaining a position so unhealthful and inconvenient," led the six companies of the Seventh formerly detailed to Nacogdoches back across the Red River to Indian Territory in December 1836.[22] At nearly the same time, the boom and bust cycle which plagued the American economy throughout the nineteenth century experienced its most dramatic downturn prior to the Civil War. Following the collapse of the Bank of England in the summer of 1836, interest rates in New York soared to heights which exceeded that of the Panic of 1819. Coupled with the collapse of cotton prices, which reached rock-bottom between 1839 and 1840, the United States' economy was gripped by economic stagnation and depression.[23] Although the worst was yet to come, numerous businesses both in New York and in other urban centers failed throughout the winter of 1836-37, and by the following winter an estimated half million people were unemployed throughout the United States.[24] Although a detailed discussion

of rampant land speculation, the Tariff of 1833, and the Panic of 1837 are outside the scope of this study, the consequences, particularly with respect to unemployment and the idle manpower available for military service are of particular significance.

Despite these pronounced economic hardships, there were events elsewhere in the United States which complicate the link between economic depression and military service, particularly after 1838. In December 1835, a party of slightly over 100 regular and "red-legged" infantry (artillery serving as infantry) and a detachment of regular artillery under the command of Major Francis L. Dade was attacked and defeated in detail by Seminole Indians on the Fort King Road. While no members of the Seventh Infantry fell in this unexpected engagement, the members of the Seventh Infantry were not untouched by this "horrible tragedy," for one of the fallen was John Slade Gatlin.[25] Gatlin, the acting assistant surgeon in Dade's command, had not only spent some time at Fort Gibson in the early 1830s, but his younger brother, Richard Caswell Gatlin, was a lieutenant in the Seventh, with a career which would continue well into the 1850s.[26] Although the reaction of Gatlin to the news of the death of his older brother is unknown, the reaction of the United States Army to this attack is well recorded, as the fires of war which raged throughout Florida after December 1835 were a result of the spark initiated by the attack on Dade's command. Although the Seventh Infantry would not be detailed to Florida until the mid-point of the war, it would nonetheless play a vital part in the attempted removal of the Seminole Indians from Florida. By the time the regiment left Florida in 1842, four new battle honors were added to the regimental colors following

actions at Fort King, Fort Drane, Martin's Point Hammock, and Wahoo Swamp.[27]

In January 1839, the Seventh Infantry was ordered away from its duties in Indian Territory to join American forces already in action in Florida. While the commander of the regiment, Brevet Brigadier General Matthew Arbuckle, remained behind to assume command of the Western Department, the regiment, led in the field by Lieutenant Colonel William Whistler, moved south to assume a role in a conflict.[28] This war, in the sympathetic opinion of Woodburn Potter, lieutenant of the Seventh and aide-de-camp for Major General Edward P. Gaines, was the result of the United States' failure to uphold the Treaty of Payne's Landing which provided for the peaceful removal of the Seminole Indians. The treaty's broken terms were, in Potter's view the main cause of the war. They were proof that "hard and unconscionable terms, extorted from [the Seminoles]. . . had only served to whet and stimulate revenge and to give old hostilities, not yet extinguished, greater exasperation and ferocity."[29]

The Seminole War took place in conjunction with the second great national economic depression. Collectively, these two events greatly affected upon the rank and file of the army between 1837 and 1841. As was the case during the Panic of 1819, the onset of economic difficulty resulted in a dramatic increase in the total number of recruits in the regiment. In 1837, the first year of the economic downturn, 350 men joined the regiment, and relatively large numbers of individuals continued to join on an annual basis throughout the duration of the five-year long economic depression. These large numbers of recruits can be attributed not only to the length of the economic difficulty, but must also be considered in response to the increase

in the military establishment called for by the War Department in 1838, as in that year Congress passed an act which added thirty-eight privates and one sergeant to each of the ten companies in the infantry regiments.[30]

Between 1837 and 1842, over thirteen hundred men joined the Seventh Infantry. Half of these individuals joined either in 1837 or 1840, with the remainder joining at essentially equal levels in 1838, 1839, and 1841 (Table 3.2). Throughout the duration of the depression and the Second Seminole War, the new enlistees were predominantly young men, and based upon their place of origin and occupation, it is possible to conclude that these individuals were motivated to military service both either by a desire for combat or the need for employment, or some combination of the two.[31]

Although native-born citizens outnumbered foreign-born enlistees at the onset of the depression, after 1837 native-born recruits were clearly in the minority. Over the next four years, well over the half of the men who joined between 1838 and 1841 (55.9 percent) were born outside the United States, a trend which reversed after the conclusion of the Seminole War, when economic conditions in the United States began to improve. Native-born soldiers who enlisted during the depression were, on average, born in those regions hit hardest by the economic panic, namely the North and East. Although there were representatives from the South and West (regions affected by land speculation and the collapse of cotton prices) their presence was completely overshadowed by enlistees from the older, more established regions of the country, as a large number of men undoubtedly sought military service as an alternative to the unemployment of the major urban areas. The Irish continued to dominate the ranks of the foreign-born, and when considered in conjunction with the anti-Irish nativist sentiment

developing in the United States throughout this period, military service was perhaps the only viable option for these victims of discrimination in the labor force. This problem was compounded after 1844, when famine refugees began to arrive in greater numbers.[32] The British and Germans followed the Irish, though their presence in the ranks was so small as to preclude the making of any generalization with respect to motivation for enlistment. If nothing else, the percentages of these individuals are proportional to the numbers of new immigrants arriving in the United States during this period, though it is difficult to tell how long these individuals had been in the United States.[33]

Perhaps the most compelling reason behind the increased presence of the foreign-born in the ranks was the result of the opportunity for military service in militia and volunteer organizations early in the Seminole War. In 1836, the interim Secretary of War Benjamin F. Butler recognized that "no less than 24,500 militia and volunteers have been mustered into service," a figure which represented nearly three times the authorized strength of the army.[34] Moreover, volunteers continued to be raised throughout much of the war; 9,479 in 1837, 371 in 1838, 793 in 1839, and 1,843 in 1840.[35] With the option of a six- or twelve-month term of service as a citizen soldier of the republic, coupled with a variety of veterans benefits awarded to the volunteer soldier if wounded or to surviving family members if the man was killed in action, no explanation is needed to relate why many Americans disdained what by 1838 became a five-year term of service in the swamps of Florida with the regular army.[36] Thus, it is relatively easy to see why a smaller number of native-born citizens sought service in the Seventh Infantry, and it is possible to theorize that had it not been for the depression,

the number of native-born enlistees during the Seminole War could have potentially been much less. While these notions are by no means definitive, the subject of volunteers and regulars being called forth together for service, and the effects of military service will be addressed in the next chapter, as regular service during the Mexican War was affected by volunteer enlistments during the first months of the war.

Regardless of the nativity of the rank and file, when all enlistees are considered collectively, no occupational group dominated the period embracing both the Panic of 1837 and Second Seminole War, as artisans, soldiers and laborers were all present in the greatest numbers at one time or another (Table 3.7). When the occupations are broken down on the basis of nativity, the situation changes dramatically. Among the ranks of the native-born recruits those individuals who listed their occupation as soldier predominated, followed closely by those who presented themselves as artisans (Table 3.8). Among foreign-born citizens, laborers were present in the greatest proportions, followed by artisans, with the number of soldiers gradually increasing after 1838 (Table 3.9).

Any number of conclusions may be made based upon this data, but when other factors are considered, the following appear to be corroborated by the present data. With respect to the native-born enlistees, it is difficult to determine whether or not these men joined out of necessity or choice, prompting the conclusion that both served as important factors determining the enlistment of American soldier. Service in the militia was present as an option to regular military service for many of these individuals. The enlistment of former militiamen is a potential source of explanation for the presence of an increased number of native-born soldiers, although the

verification of such a notion is difficult, if not impossible. In contrast, the immigrant seemed to be driven to the army more out of necessity rather than choice. Not only did the unskilled laborer form the great mass of the foreign-born enlistees, but unskilled labor was plentiful during the depression, as evidenced by the high unemployment rates throughout the late 1830s and early 1840s.[37]

There was minimal economic recovery in 1840 and 1841 as prices of cotton and manufactured goods rose slightly, although it was not until 1843 that the depression completely ran its course.[38] However, by that time most of the Seminole Indians had either been moved to Indian Territory, or remained in the swamps of south Florida. On 12 October 1841, John C. Spencer replaced John Bell as Secretary of War, following the resignation of President John Tyler's cabinet. At the request of Colonel William Jenkins Worth, immediate commander in the region, Commanding General of the Army Winfield Scott persuaded Secretary Spencer to not only begin the removal of regular forces from Florida, but also began to urge the government to end the eight-year-long Florida War. On 10 May 1842 Scott's requests were realized, as he was notified by the Secretary of War that the United States government no longer desired to continue hostilities against the Seminoles, regardless of whether or not all members of the tribe had been captured and moved to Indian Territory.[39]

With the effective conclusion of the Second Seminole War, the United States Army, no longer needed to wage war against the Florida Indians, was gradually reduced in size. Citing the act of August 23, 1842, Secretary of War Spencer suspended the General Recruiting Service (GRS), and over the course of the next eighteen months, no recruits were enlisted

until the strength of the companies in each regiment fell below the authorized limits (for infantry, the proscribed strength was four sergeants, four corporals, two musicians and forty-two privates).[40] At the same time, units of the United States Army began the slow withdrawal from Florida to other locations on the borders of the United States.

On 20 July 1842, the Seventh Infantry left its posts in north Florida, reassigned to a number of coastal batteries on the Gulf of Mexico. Despite the entreaties of General Scott, who argued that "small garrisons, scattered along a wide frontier, always, after a time, deteriorate in morals and military efficiency," the various regiments of the army by necessity were divided among a number of posts, as the army was reduced in size at the end of the war, and large units could not provide enough the requisite manpower to occupy all necessary posts along the frontier.[41] The Seventh Infantry was no exception to this, as in January 1842, it was ordered to garrison coastal batteries on the Gulf of Mexico and New Orleans Barracks and continued to do so until the regiment left for Texas in 1844.[42]

Despite the suspension of the GRS at the conclusion of the Seminole War, 238 men enlisted in the Seventh Infantry between the conclusion of that conflict in 1842 and the end of 1844, recruited under the General Regulations of 1841. In the two years immediately after the Seminole War, only a few men enlisted in the regiment, due to the reduction of he military establishment. However, with the re-establishment of the GRS in 1844, a significant number of new recruits joined the Seventh Infantry each year.

Between 1842 and 1844, enlistees in the Seventh Infantry were predominantly young native-born men (59.7 percent of the total enlistees) who were primarily from the North and East (Table 3.5). These American

enlistees were mostly artisans and laborers, though by 1844, those men whose stated occupation was soldier returned to dominate the ranks (Table 3.8). The remaining enlistees (40.3 percent) came from six different countries, with Ireland and Germany being represented in the largest proportions, comprising 51.3 and 30.8 percent of the foreign born enlistees, respectively by 1844 (Table 3.6). The occupational diversity of the immigrant enlistees was similar to their native-born comrades-in-arms, as these men displayed a tendency to have been employed either as soldiers or artisans. Although letters or memoirs from these men do not exist (most were probably illiterate), many of these men undoubtedly saw service at some point during the Seminole War, or were still in military service as a result of the economic panic of 1837.[43]

The preceding analysis has illustrated that while the War Department was concerned with the moral fiber of the American soldier and enacted legislation to improve its character, such policies are often lost in the confusion of economic difficulty and combat service. As a result, a wide variety of individuals enlisted between 1831 and 1844, each possessing any number of motives for military service, whether that be patriotism, an adventurous spirit, or economic necessity. Based solely upon the information enlistees provided (age, place of birth and occupation) it is difficult, if not impossible to ascertain moral character. However, an examination of the desertion and reenlistment statistics of the Seventh Infantry allows for some tentative conclusions to be drawn with respect to what types of men joined the military, and whether or not they entered military service out of choice or necessity.

Since the establishment of a standing army after the War of 1812, desertion was a constant problem and was the subject of a number of studies issued by the War Department. The deserters in the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1844, appeared to follow trends outlined in the previous chapter. Most tended to be relatively young men under the age of 27, who elected to desert early during their term of service (Tables 3.11 and 3.12), though it should be noted that the desertions in the fourth and fifth year may not accurately reflect earlier patterns considering the differences in the length of service between 1833 and 1838. Most deserters left the service once, never to be seen again. However, there were a significant number of individuals who deserted and were apprehended, and some who deserted multiple times (Table 3.13).

In 1831, Secretary of War Lewis Cass spoke out against the problem of desertion, and in his annual report wrote, "I regret to say this serious evil not only continues, but increases."[44] Based upon statistics compiled from the preceding five years, Cass estimated that in 1831 alone, some 1450 men deserted from the ranks, at a cost in wages, training and equipment of $118,321. Moreover, Cass recognized that "the American soldier is well paid, fed, and clothed . . . and ample provision is made for his support. But his moral culture is wholly neglected."[45]

In an attempt to improve the moral fiber of the soldiery, the next year an order was issued by the Secretary of War which eliminated the daily whiskey ration, in its place substituting "Four pounds of coffee, and eight pounds of sugar . . . to be issued with every one hundred rations." Additionally, a regulation was adopted prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors by the sutlers to the troops, thus attempting to block its introduction

into camps and forts of the United States.[46] The presence of numerous purveyors of alcohol who established "grog shops" in close proximity to frontier forts made it impossible to eliminate alcohol, but this act, passed in 1833, undoubtedly reduced the level of alcohol consumption on military posts and was the most comprehensive legislation bent on improving the plight of the rank and file.

It is difficult to ascertain whether or not the Act of 2 March had any effect with respect to desertions among the enlisted ranks. After its passage, the number of desertions increased slightly, with the greatest increases taking place during the Panic of 1837 and after the regiment was posted to the coastal batteries in 1843. The exact provisions of this act, having been previously discussed, did not clearly affect the desertion rate, but exercised more influence upon the numbers of reenlistees in the regiment. The year following the passage of the act, 48 men elected to reenlist in the regiment. Although this high rate was not sustained throughout the period 1833-1844, it will be recognized that large numbers of reenlistees are present in 1837 (the first year of the depression) and in 1840.

The men who remained in 1837 probably did so out of economic necessity, as they were without jobs in the civilian market. While economic necessity undoubtedly influenced the enlistees of 1840, the reasoning behind those who elected to keep their uniforms in 1840 is somewhat more enigmatic. The possibility exists that they could have been young men who joined (or slightly older men who reenlisted) at the onset of the depression, and as economic troubles were still present 1840, these individuals elected to remain in the army rather than attempt employment in society. However, if this were the case, similarly high rates of reenlistment would be expected in

1838 and 1839, which clearly was not the situation. To suggest that these reenlistees of 1837 and 1840 had enlisted in 1834, and hoped to benefit from the conditions of the act of 1833 is a bit extreme, though for some this certainly may have been the case. At any rate, these possibilities suggest that a number of men saw military service as an alternative to employment in society between 1831 and 1844, and consciously chose the military as a means of sustenance. For many, the military was much more, as related by enlisted man J.S., presumably a member of the 7th who wrote from Fort Coffee in February 1836. He recognized that [some of the rank and file] "become firmly attached to that method of life, and being destitute of relations, they seem to view the members of the army, as one great and extensive family; and on being required from any cause, to leave the service, they experience the feelings of one, who is discarded by his own family, and that same feeling has a great tendency to induce reenlistment."[47]

Although those men who reenlisted probably earned the favor of the officers under whom they served, military records are filled with accounts of men who were less fortunate and incurred the wrath of the men who commanded them. Although in the minority, deserters who were apprehended invariably fell into this category. After the elimination of the death sentence as a punishment for desertion in 1833, and the restoration of whipping as punishment for this crime, military records and the personal reminiscences of both officers and men are replete with the lash being used as a tool of "encouragement" for wayward soldiers.[48] However, other punishments were more popular and, as Edward Coffman indicates, soldiers often faced the prospect of riding the wooden horse, standing on a barrel, wearing a ball and chain, or being bucked and gagged, a form of punishment

having a rag forced into the mouth with arms bound around knees with a stick under the bent legs.[49] In addition, men were also placed in the omnipresent guardhouse, or were simply sentenced to hard labor. While officers looked to hard labor as a means to both punish and reform wayward soldiers, for the rank and file, it afforded them yet another opportunity to play the old soldier and avoid work altogether, especially when aided by lackadaisical officers who failed to oversee their work details.

Perhaps one of the most memorable stories told of soldiers avoiding punishment took place in 1837, and was recalled four years later by First Lieutenant George McCall in a letter to his brother. It seems that during the summer months of 1837 and 1838, Brigadier General Arbuckle allowed a portion of the Seventh Infantry to leave the stockade at Fort Gibson, and establish their company streets at a more healthy location, on a hill overlooking the garrison. However, the hill upon which the detachment relocated did not have a water well, and it was necessary to haul water up the hill to the companies, a fair distance from the old stockade. To solve this problem, General Arbuckle detailed two prisoners from the guardhouse who had been sentenced at hard labor to excavate a well more suitably located for the companies. Although these men began excavating the well in the fall of 1837, after the detachment had returned to the stockade, work continued throughout the winter of 1838, the soldiers obediently leaving under guard, and returning at the end of day to record the additional depth which they had dug. At the beginning of the next summer (1838), the soldiers on detail had yet to reach water, and "the good old General ordered the prisoners to push their work and get to water before the summer had reached the dog-

days," as the troops who were to occupy the hillside had already expressed their disgust at the prospect of hauling water for another summer.

By October, the General wondered why the two men had not reached the level of the nearby Arkansas river, and ordered his aide-de-camp to calculate the level of the well based upon the numbers recorded in the daily reports. After a short time, the astonished officer returned and informed the General that according to the daily reports, the well was 465 feet and 9 inches deep! Much to the general's disgust (and amazement) he called for his orderly and promptly ordered him to inspect the well. Upon the junior officer's arrival at the site, he prepared to descend into the shaft. McCall related:

> What was his surprise, when at the depth of fifteen feet he landed on a flat rock, which covered what he soon found out was the bottom of the well, upon which the two prisoners were seated face to face, with a pack of playing cards between them, a-playing "Old Sledge." The facts are explained in a few words.-- When the prisoners had reached the depth above stated, they came to a large gneiss rock upon which it was rather tiresome picking; and as they found the temperature a pleasant one--cool in the summer, and moderate and free from winds in the winter, and as they always brought their dinners and a jug of water with them, it was quite an agreeable, snug little place to pass the day playing Old Sledge or All Fours. The thing was carried out so skillfully [sic] by these fellows, that, together with a little remissness on the part of their superiors, the game had been successfully played for eighteen months.[50]

The reaction of General Arbuckle to the actions of these individuals is unknown, but it is impossible not to applaud the efforts of two individuals, as it must be recognized as one of the most clever stunts of enlisted men on punishment detail. While their exploits provide a light-hearted reminder of the more frivolous moments of antebellum army life, other factors besides

desertion and punishment had deleterious effects upon the rank and file of the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1844, namely disease and death, either by illness or otherwise.

Between 1831 and 1844, 514 members of the regiment died, either as a result of a malady contracted while in government service, or as a result of combat in the Seminole War. During this time, the death rate exceeded fifty men per year twice: 1834, and between 1840 and 1843. Although death was a significant factor throughout the years in question, these two periods are worthy of special consideration for a number of reasons.

Charles E. Rosenberg determined that 1832 was the first "Cholera Year" in the United States, as it was the first time cholera reached epidemic proportions, having heretofore been overshadowed by smallpox and yellow fever on the North American continent. On 6 June 1832, it appeared in Montreal, Canada, and gradually spread throughout the United States with outbreaks of the disease continuing until 1833 and 1834.[51] During the summer of 1834, the disease arrived at Fort Gibson, and undoubtedly aided by the unfavorable environment, struck with a vengeance. George Catlin, the renowned frontier artist who spent many months at Fort Gibson in the 1830s, said that he heard the "mournful sound of 'Roslin Castle' with muffled drums, passing six or eight times a day under my window, to the burying ground," and estimated that some 150 dragoons had died since June 1834, with casualty statistics being equally as high with the infantry.[52] Sixty-eight members of the Seventh Infantry died in 1834, and the relatively poor location of the camp was an issue of much anxiety for General Arbuckle throughout his tenure at the post, with the high rate of illness providing the

motivation to move part of the garrison to a more healthful location during the warm summer months.

Issues of health were not raised in 1836, when Secretary of War Lewis Cass proposed the removal of the garrison at Fort Gibson to a place more conducive to the protection of the Western Frontier (as at its present location the post was some 40 miles inside the Cherokee Nation). Despite Cass's relative ignorance of the situation at the post, the well-being (or lack thereof) of the fort's occupants was recognized shortly thereafter. Although General Arbuckle believed that Gibson was more healthful than Fort Coffee, to which the garrison at Gibson was to be removed, not all of the company officers were in agreement, as they believed that the poor climate at Gibson was a major contributing factor to the illness of the garrison. Captain Joseph A. Phillips of the Seventh was perhaps most adamant about the unhealthful nature of Fort Gibson, as he wrote to General Macomb in December 1835, "We are losing our best men here [at Fort Gibson], in consequence of this incessant labor, who go off to other stations to enlist, to avoid these toilsome duties [continued reconstruction of rotting portions of the fort]. In fact, I have almost come to the conclusion that the troops at this post, instead of being enlisted as soldiers to perform military duty, are received into the service to become only 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.'" Such pleas apparently went unheard as the next month he wrote, "Ought not the deaths of officers and soldiers who have fallen victims to the diseases of this climate be considered as a sufficient sacrifice," noting that during the last two years, 292 soldiers and six officers died, and during the third quarter of 1835, the surgeon reported 601 distinct cases of disease among the infantry alone, a significant number considering that in September, only 416 members of the

regiment were stationed at the post.[53] As indicated in Table 3. 10, the deaths remained constant while the regiment was at Fort Gibson, and continued while the regiment was posted in Nacogdoches, as the unhealthy conditions were among the primary motivating factors in the removal of the Seventh Infantry from Texas and its return to Indian Territory. However, Florida remained the most hazardous location occupied by the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1844. Although they were posted in the more healthy northern region of the state, the regiment was not free from the ill-affects of the climate.

The first year after arrival of the Seventh Infantry in Florida saw the greatest number of casualties, no doubt the result of the rank and file being struck down by illness before the constitutions of the members of the regiment could adjust to the new climate and conditions. By 1842, 179 had perished, either as a result of illness or combat with the Indians. First Lieutenant John T. Sprague of the Eighth Infantry was among the first to chronicle the events of the Seminole War, and offered this analysis as to why the affairs in Florida had a detrimental effect upon the rank and file: "The prevailing disease was dysentery, caused by being obliged to drink the turbid water from stagnant pools, and aggravated by the long continued and unvaried heat of the summer . . . The troops sunk under the debility arising from exposure to the noonday suns, constant rains, cool nights, turbid water, and the heavy marches through the deep sands." Although hospitals were established at Picolata and Cedar Key, many fell victim to the illnesses in that warm, damp climate throughout the regiment's three-year tenure in Florida, a factor which the military undoubtedly considered when they chose to end the war in 1842.[54]

That is not to say, however, that the elements were the only threat to the enlisted man of the Seventh Infantry in Florida, as their opponent in that conflict could be just as deadly. Although the Regiment was not involved in any of the more well known battles in the United States' first guerrilla war, it did, however, see its share of combat against the Seminole Indians, as 28 enlisted men and two officers fell in combat with the enemy between 1839 and 1842. In the defense of their tribal lands, the Seminoles did not discriminate with respect to rank, or military position, and, as was the case at Martin's Point Hammock, often overlooked the sex of their victims as well.[55]

On 28 December 1840, Second Lieutenant Walter Sherwood left for Micanopy in north-central Florida for Wacahoota, accompanied by Mrs. Montgomery, wife of Lieutenant Alexander Montgomery of the Seventh Infantry, and an escort of eleven men. Mid-way between the two posts, the party was attacked by a number of Seminoles, and Mrs. Montgomery and four privates were killed outright, with the remainder falling after being overwhelmed by the superior numbers of the Indians. Although little is known of the ten men who fell with Lieutenant Sherwood and Mrs. Montgomery, the efforts of Private Lansing Burlingham of Company C were addressed specifically in Sprague's history of the war:

> Alone, and mortally wounded, he protected the body of Mrs. Montgomery from the merciless barbarities of the savages, who gathered around her, determined to gratify their diabolical revenge. "Lieutenant," said he (addressing Lieutenant Montgomery who had arrived), "I fought for her as long as I could; but they were too strong for me,"--his voice here faltered--"but I did my duty." These were his last words.[56]

By 1842, the Seventh Infantry was no longer posted in Florida and had been moved to other nearby locations, departing from Cedar Key, Florida on 20 July 1842. Although a number of men died after this date, it is difficult to tell whether or not these men died from illnesses contracted while in Florida, or from exposure to the elements at the new posts which the Seventh occupied after 1842. Regardless, the number of men who died in the regiment after 1843 declined, as the Gulf Coast was a much more healthy location for service than was the swamps of central and south Florida.

When all things are considered, how did the enlistees of 1831-1844 compare with the men who served in the Seventh during the fifteen years after the conclusion of the War of 1812? It has been observed that while these men were initially similar to the enlistees of the earlier period, by 1844 the rank and file had undergone a number of changes. While the young adventurer still composed a significant percentage of the recruits, the foreign-born began to enlist in ever-increasing numbers, as these victims of discrimination in the private sector turned to the army as a means of support during their first years in the United States. However, only during the Seminole War did foreign-born recruits ever dominate the ranks, as Americans more than likely either sought service with the more popularly acceptable militia units, or avoided military service altogether, though during the Depression of 1837-1842 this was often difficult.

In 1839, Frederick Marryat, a former British officer traveling in the United States wrote, "the privates of the American regular army are not the most creditable soldiers in the world; they are chiefly composed of Irish emigrants, Germans, and deserters from the English regiments in Canada. Americans are very rare; only those who can find nothing else to do and

have to choose between enlistment and starvation, will enter into the American army."[57] With notions such as these, coupled with traditional American prejudice against the regular army, it is understandable why the United States Army, and more specifically the rank and file, was generally viewed with derision by both the American populace and by foreign travelers throughout the antebellum period.

Based upon continued analysis of the Seventh Infantry, Marryat's bold assumptions are not without their faults, and if the Cottonbalers are representative of the United States Army, the Briton's views are in need of reevaluation. First and foremost, throughout the second half of the "thirty years' peace," the Seventh Infantry was dominated by native-born recruits, who sometimes formed as much as 70 percent of the enlistments for any given year. Moreover, the notion of the American soldier not being "the most creditable soldiers in the world" must also be carefully weighed in light of existing evidence.

When considered collectively, the enlistees between 1831 and 1844 appear to be comprised of relatively equal numbers of laborers, soldiers, and artisans. However, when the foreign-born and native-born are considered separately, the foreign-born ranks are filled with men who were listed as common laborers, while the ranks of native-citizens were composed predominantly of soldiers. Such notions are certainly worthy of further study, as the large numbers of native-born citizens joining the regular army by choice certainly run counter to the widely-held belief of an immigrant-army during the antebellum era. Regardless, the men who served in the Seventh Infantry between 1831 and 1844 not only considered themselves as

soldiers, but performed admirably under what were often difficult circumstances.

The Second Seminole War was the most difficult protracted conflict in which the United States Army had been engaged. While the War of 1812 was not without its problems with respect to command, supply, and logistics, only the threat of Napoleon prevented Great Britain from bringing its entire military force to bear against the United States. The Seminole War presented new difficulties, and illustrated that the army of the United States was not prepared to adequately counter the guerrilla tactics of the wily Seminole Indians, much less an army of professionally trained soldiers in the European mold. However, by the conclusion of the decade of the 1840s, the United States Army would fight another war, widely considered to be a sound application of the military art and science which had been learned by the young officers of the United States Army. While the education of these men is not the subject of this work, the men they led are, and over the next four years, the most dramatic fluctuations took place with respect to composition of the United States Army. While previous changes can be linked with national depression and minor changes in military policy, the changes between 1845 and 1848 were caused by the immediate effect of war.

## Notes

## Chapter III

1. U.S. Congress, American State Papers: Military Affairs, 7 vols. (Washington, DC: Gales and Seaton, 1831-61) 4: 717.

2. The Act was passed on 28 May, 1830, by the 1st Session of the 21st Congress, 1st Session. The complete text of the act can be viewed in Francis Paul Prucha's, Documents of United States Indian Policy (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), 52-53.

3. Grant Foreman, Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, 2d ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), iii.

4. Between the regiment's movement to Fort Gibson in 1825 and its withdrawal to Florida in 1839, the Seventh Infantry built or oversaw the construction of an extensive road network in Indian Territory, linking Fort Smith with Forts Gibson, Coffee, and Towson. William P. Corbett, "Rifles and Ruts: Army Road Builders in Indian Territory," Chronicles of Oklahoma 60 (Fall 82), 294-300.

5. The complex nature of the role of the Seventh Infantry and the United States Army in the western territory is best described in Brad Agnew, Fort Gibson: Terminal on the Trail of Tears (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980).

6. January 1831-December 1844, Regimental Returns of the Seventh Infantry, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, rolls 77-79.

7. Commanding General Alexander Macomb to the Secretary of War, November 1832 in Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress,

ASP:MA, 5:31, and "An Act to Increase the Military Establishment," 15 June 1832, in John F. Callan, Military Laws of the United States, Relating to the Army, Volunteers, Militia, and to Bounty Lands and Pensions, from the Founding of the Government to 3 March, 1862 (Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1863), 309.

8. "An Act to Increase the Military Establishment" 23 May 1836, Ibid., 323.

9. "Consolidation and Adaptation of the Existing Laws to the Present Military Establishment of the United States," 10 December 1832, in U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 5: 83, Section 16, Article 82.

10. Order No. 43, Adjutant General's Office, 13 August 1828, quoted in Francis Paul Prucha, Sword of the Republic: The United States Army and the Frontier, 1783-1846 (New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprint, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 327.

11. "Consolidation and Adaptation of the Existing Laws to the Present Military Establishment of the United States" 10 December 1832, in U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 5: 83, Section 16, Articles 83-84.

12. 1842 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress, 27th Congress, 3rd Session, Senate Executive Document 1, 212; 1843 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress., 28th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen Exec. Doc. 1, 140.

13. "An Act to Improve the Condition of the Non-Commissioned Officers and Privates of the Army and Marine Corps of the United States, and to Prevent Desertion," 2 March 1833 in Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 328.

14. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957 (Washington: G.P.O., 1960), 106.

15. "Act to Improve the Condition of the Non-commissioned Officers and Privates of the Army and Marine Corps of the United States and to Prevent Desertion," 2 March 1833, in Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 328-29.

16. U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 5: 169

17. Ibid., 5: 173

18. 1833 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 5: 173.

19. Douglas North, The Economic Growth of the United States, 1790-1860 (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1961), 194-196.

20. "Recommendation of an Increase of the Force under Major General Gaines," 12 May 1836, U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 6:679.

21. Philip Haythornthwaite, The Alamo and the War of Texan Independence, Osprey Men at Arms Series (London: Osprey Publishing, 1985), 42; Noah Smithwick, The Evolution of a State, or Recollections of Old Texas Days (Austin, TX: Gammell Book Co., 1900: reprint Austin, TX: The Steck Co., 1935), 133; Stephen Hardin, Texian Iliad: A Military History of the Texas Revolution, 1835-1836 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994), 176-178, 208. Daughters of the Republic of Texas, Muster Rolls of the Texas Revolution (Lubbock: Craftsman Printers, 1986).

22. 1836 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 6: 808, and November and December 1836, Regimental Returns of the Seventh Infantry, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 78.

23. North, Economic Growth, 200-201.

24. Charles Sellers, The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 354-55.

25. Woodburn Potter, The War in Florida: An Exposition of Its Causes, and an Accurate History of the Campaigns of Generals Clinch, Gaines, and Scott, by a late Staff Officer (Baltimore: Lewis and Coleman, 1836; reprint, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1966), 108-9.

26. Frank L. Laumer, Dade's Last Command (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995), 101-2.

27. Theophilus F. Rodenbough and William L. Haskin, eds. The Army of the United States: Historical Sketches of Staff and Line with Portraits of Generals in Chief (New York: Maynard Merrill and Co., 1896), 498; John T. Sprague, The Origin, Progress, and Conclusion of the Seminole War (New York: Appleton, 1848), 249, 438-44.

28. Sprague, Seminole War, 274.

29. Potter, War in Florida, 38

30. "An Act to Increase the Present Military Establishment of the United States," 5 July 1838, Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 341. This Act also provided that a privates pay would be raised to eight dollars from the standing six, and that a reenlistment bonus of three months pay (over the previous two) and a 160 acre land grant would be given at the conclusion of five years service. However, on 7 July, the raise was reduced to seven dollars and the land grant eliminated.

31. Considering the amount of money which could potentially be accumulated after five years service (sixty dollars) the argument can be made

that these men joined the service for economic gain. However, the verification of such hypotheses necessitate further research utilizing paymaster records which would indicate how much money these men had in their possession at the conclusion of their term of service.

32. George W. Potter, To the Golden Door: The Story of the Irish in Ireland and America (Boston: Little. Brown and Co., 1960), 316-318; Sean Wilentz, Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 299.

33. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics , 57.

34. 1836 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 6: 812.

35. Emory Upton, Military Policy of the United States (Washington, DC: G.P.O.; reprint, New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 175, 190.

36. In the 1837 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 7:590. Commanding General Alexander Macomb recommended the return to the old five-year term of enlistment, as "three years does not allow for sufficient experience," particularly with respect to the mounted arm of the service. The term of service was raised the next year.

37. North, Economic Growth, 202-203.

38. Ibid.

39. John K. Mahon, History of the Second Seminole War, 2d ed. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1967: revised, Gainesville: University of Florida, 1985), 309-310.

40. "An Act Respecting the Organization of the Army, and for Other Purposes, " Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 358.

41. Commanding General of the Army Winfield Scott in 1843 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 28th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. 1, 63.

42. Regimental Returns, June 1842-August, 1845; National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 79: Annual Reports of the Secretary of War, 1842-1844; 27th Cong., 3rd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. 1 (1842), 28th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. 1 (1843), 28th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. 1 (1844).

43. Unless otherwise noted, all statistical data quoted in this study are compiled from Registers of Enlistments in the United States Army: National Archives, RG 94, Entry 89, Microcopy 233, rolls 19-21.

44. 1831 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 4:708.

45. Ibid., 709.

46. 1832 Annual Report of the Secretary of War, ASP:MA, 5: 20.

47. J.S. in Army and Navy Chronicle 2 (7 April 1836), 219.

48. "An Act to Exempt Deserters, in Time of Peace, from the Punishment of Death," 29 May 1833, Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 322; "An Act to Improve the Condition of the Noncommissioned Officers of the Army and Marine Corps, and to Prevent Desertion," 2 March 1833, Ibid., 328-29.

49. Edward Coffman, The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 197.

50. George McCall, Letters from the Frontiers (Philadelphia: J.P. Lippincott and Co., 1868; reprint, Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1974), 373-74.

51. Charles Rosenberg, The Cholera Years: The United States in 1832, 1849 and 1866 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 1, 23, 37-39.

52. George Catlin, Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indian, 2 vols. 4th ed. (London: David Bogue, 1844), 2: 80.

53. "On the Expediency of Removing the Troops from Fort Gibson to the Western Boundary of Arkansas," U.S. Congress, ASP:MA, 6: 182-183: Regimental Returns, September 1835; National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 78.

54. Sprague, The Florida War, 257, 273.

55. Ibid., 484.

56. Ibid., 248, 484.

57. Frederick Marryat, A Diary in America, with Remarks on Its Institutions, 3 vols. (London: 1839), 2: 305.

## CHAPTER IV

## TO THE HALLS OF THE MONTEZUMAS!: 1845-1848

> "At this time the command 'charge' was renewed, and the fort was carried by a simultaneous rush of the Seventh Infantry, driving back the enemy with much slaughter; the enemy's flag at this moment being taken down . . . and the flag and standard of the Seventh Infantry were raised and floated in its place."
>
> -Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Plympton,
> Seventh Regiment U.S. Infantry,
> following action at Cerro Gordo, Mexico,
> 18 April 1847[1]

The Mexican War has been characterized as the first foreign war waged by the United States.[2] Throughout the course of the campaigns in Northern and Central Mexico, the men of the Seventh Infantry accumulated numerous honors and awards of meritorious service for the regiment. Despite the contributions of this regiment and other established units in the United States Army, the regular forces have been largely ignored by scholars of the Mexican War, as the legacy of the more numerous (and often more literate) volunteers have overshadowed the regulars who fought and died alongside them on the road to Mexico City.

Similarly, during the Mexican War and thereafter, both the popular press and the American public emphasized the efforts of volunteer soldiers, the virtuous citizen-soldiers of the republic engaged on a patriotic crusade of "Manifest Destiny," over the regular soldiers obediently practicing the vocation of Mars. Because of this bias, the actions of regular army regiments, which composed the bulk of units involved in wartime operations both on Texas-Mexico border and in Central Mexico, were often overlooked. In those

cases where the regular army was discussed, it was spoken of in derisive terms, or was viewed as made up of the contemptible Irish, worthless European immigrants from the continent, and the dregs of American society. While such characterizations may in fact possess an element of truth, to speak of the entire army, and more specifically the Seventh Regiment as filled with such men throughout the Mexican War is not entirely true. Over the course of the war, the social composition of the regiment underwent significant change as new incentives were added to raise recruits for the United States Army.[3]

Early accounts of the Mexican War published by volunteer officers and men recently returned from Mexico mentioned little with respect to the regular army enlistees throughout the course of the war. Instead, they spoke of the regulars in a manner similar to that of George C. Furber, a lawyer who enlisted in Company G of the Tennessee Regiment of Cavalry. In Furber's The Twelve Months' Volunteer, first published in 1847, the author presented this view of the regular soldier:

> A regular soldier, who follows it for a livelihood, in peace and war, in garrison and in camp, has need for only so much brains as will enable him to stand erect, keep his clothing clean and neat, and his arms bright; to enable him to go through the common evolutions, and to understand the common words of command, without explanation; to handle the musket, sword and pistol quickly; and just language enough to ask for his allowance of eatables and whatever else he may need to satisfy his appetite, and to be able, when out of the hearing of officers, to swear freely.---If he has any more brains or language than is sufficient to answer these purposes, they are of no value to him; for he will never be permitted to use them.

Opinions of this nature were commonplace among the American public, as the "drilled automatons" and "musket-holding machines" present in the

ranks of the regular army presented themselves as a threat to liberty--a fear present since the early days of the republic. In the eyes of many, the bastions of American liberty and independence were best protected by the free-thinking citizen-volunteer, not the trained regular who was unable to think for himself and was simply conditioned to obey the commands of West Point-trained officers. Because of these anti-professional military biases, the volunteers were often given the lion's share of the credit for the successes of the Mexican War, where they performed admirably in what most Americans saw as a stunning display of prowess-at-arms over a lesser people.[4]

These themes were echoed in early studies of the war with Mexico. Nathan Covington Brooks, author of A Complete History of the Mexican War: Its Causes, Conduct, and Consequences, published in 1848, viewed the war as a turning point in warfare, as it combined "the individual heroism of the old chivalric era with the warlike science of modern time." Recognizing that the individual and freedom of choice was of paramount importance to military science, Brooks denigrated the regulars and lauded the volunteer observing, "an independence of thought and action enables him [the volunteer] to cope successfully from dangers from which no mere skill could extricate him, and to win battles after science has pronounced them irrecoverably lost."[5]

Seventy years later, Justin Smith offered a more critical study of the Mexican War, which included a closer evaluation of the American forces involved. His The War with Mexico, published in 1919, was based upon the analysis of primary documents found both in the United States and Mexico, and was far superior to previous studies of the war. Unlike previous accounts, he viewed the volunteers with somewhat of a jaundiced eye,

noting that while on an individual level they might be "braver than the regulars," they often presented themselves as "one costly mass of ignorance, confusion and insubordination," more prone to fight when they pleased (among themselves, as well as with the regulars and the civilian populace) rather when they were needed. Although Smith recognized that the American public viewed the regulars as, "a set of puppets . . . shut up without exercise and in barracks, from year's end to year's end," he did note that they "were preferable not only in camp and on the march, but on the field," as they adhered to military discipline more readily and "helped immensely to steady the volunteers." Of more importance to this study, Smith identified the regulars present in the early engagements at Fort Brown, Palo Alto, and Resaca de la Palma as being "of European birth and a large percentage of Roman Catholics," noting that many, specifically members of the Seventh Infantry, were prone to desertion based upon the lure of "gayly [sic] dressed sirens" and promises of rewards offered by Mexican officials.[6]

Smith's description of the rank and file of the regular army, albeit brief, provided a foundation upon which later scholars built more sophisticated analyses of the army in the Mexican War. In 1963, Edward J. Nichols asserted that 47 percent of Taylor's army at the war's outset was foreign born. When the entire army was considered, Nichols identified 24 percent as Irish, 10 percent German, 6 percent English, 3 percent Scotch, with the remaining 4 percent coming from Canada, Western Europe and Scandinavia. These figures were seconded in later studies of the war by John S.D. Eisenhower, K. Jack Bauer, and John E. Weems. All of the aforementioned estimated that in 1845, between 40 and 50 percent of rank

and file in the regular army was foreign born. Furthermore, all cited nativity as one of the prime factors which influenced desertion, a notion which will be considered elsewhere in this chapter.[7]

In 1992, James McCaffrey published Army of Manifest Destiny, the most detailed study of the American Army during the Mexican War to date. In it, he sought to emulate Bell Wiley's Life of Johnny Reb and Life of Billy Yank in examining the Mexican War from the perspective of the common soldier. McCaffrey, in his discussion of the nativity of the regular army during the Mexican War, noted that, foreign-born soldiers comprised approximately 40 percent of the regular army, based upon a small and unscientific study of a sample of 388 enlistments in the regular army. However, his analysis was based upon too small a sample, and utilized incomplete data which prevented him from making a complete analysis of the changing composition of the rank and file during the war.[8]

These historiographical landmarks provide a point of departure for the continued study of the Seventh Infantry. Focusing upon the enlistees in the regiment between 1845 and 1848, it is possible to more closely examine ethnicity, and desertion, elements highly emphasized in most studies of the Mexican War. In addition, such analysis provides a means to determine who joined the regular army and why during the Mexican War. However, before this analysis can commence, it is first necessary to understand the status of the Cottonbalers before the war.

Since the conclusion of the war in Florida in 1842, the Seventh, like the other regiments in the army, was posted to a number of fortifications and outposts on the fringes of the United States, where it was entrusted with the guardianship of the border of the republic. Facing the standards provided in

the "General Regulations of the United States Army," few men joined the army between 1842 and 1844 as the General Recruiting Service was suspended to aid in the reduction in force after Seminole War.[9] With the reactivation of the GRS, the regulations which applied during the last year of the Seminole War and would hold true during the Mexican War called for the enlistment of, "free white male persons, above the age of 18, and under the age of 35 years, being at least 5 feet 5 inches high, who are 'effective, able-bodied citizens of the United States,' native or naturalized, sober, free from disease, and who speak and understand the English Language." The recruiting officers were instructed to enlist, "None but men of good character, sound in body and mind, of good appearance, and well formed, and fit, in every particular, to perform the duties of a soldier."[10] Once enlisted, these men were expected to serve for a period of five years and, barring illness, injury, or court martial, were given the option of being discharged or reenlisting at the end of their term.

Between 1842 and 1844, 238 men became Cottonbalers (as compared to 194 in 1841 and 197 in 1845), as the suspension of the General Recruiting Service brought few new enlistees to the ranks.[11] Of those who joined between 1842 and 1844, most were young, native-born (approximately 55 percent) farmers and laborers from the northeastern portions of the United States. The remainder (44 percent) were foreign-born, with Ireland and Germany comprising 51.3 and 30.8 percent of the foreign-born enlistees, respectively, during the three-year period prior to 1845. They were of comparable age, and employed primarily as laborers with a relatively equal number of farmers and artisans also present. Although limited in number, the national and occupational composition of these recruits, adhered closely

to the percentages cited by the earlier scholars of the Mexican War mentioned earlier.

While these men and Seminole War veterans of the Seventh Infantry were employed in construction and maintenance details at posts along the Gulf of Mexico, the annexation of Texas dramatically changed the nature of relations between the United States and its neighbor to the south. Although the dispute with Mexico over the status of Texas had been minimized since 1837, Texas' successful bid for statehood reawakened a disagreement which had been avoided by the United States for many years. Since the conclusion of the Texas Revolution, both Texas and the United States recognized the Rio Grande River as the southern boundary of Texas. Mexico, arguing that the Treaty of Velasco was signed under duress, maintained that the actual boundary between the two republics was the Nueces river, over one hundred miles north of the Rio Grande. Not only did Mexico dispute the southern boundary of Texas, but viewed its annexation by the United States as an act of war. To defend against American encroachment into Mexican territory, Mexican President General Jose Joaquoin de Herrera called all state and federal troops of the Republic of Mexico into service in early June, 1845. Shortly thereafter, the United States responded when President James K. Polk ordered Brevet Brigadier General Zachary Taylor to assemble a 3,000 man "Army of Observation" at Corpus Christi, Texas.[12]

Throughout the summer of 1845, the ten companies of the Seventh Infantry and the other regular army units scattered along the United States' frontier were gradually ordered to Corpus Christi, Texas. By September the Seventh Infantry was assembled, and for the first time since June 1832, all companies in the entire regiment were mustered together at one location.[13]

Second Lieutenant Napoleon Jackson Tecumseh Dana, a recent graduate of West Point, had joined the Seventh in 1842,[14] and his letters provide a record of the Seventh's experiences on the beaches of the Gulf coast. Comparing his regiment to the others assembled, Dana wrote to his wife on September 23 that, "We are decidedly the best regiment here, and have the finest and most military-looking camp. As for the crack regiments, self-styled, the Third and Fourth, I do not think they can compare with us with much credit to themselves. . . "[15] Over the next six months, Dana, the Seventh, and the other units mustered at Corpus Christi prepared for the coming war.

While General Taylor, his officers, and the rank and file of the army refamiliarized themselves with regimental and brigade-size maneuvers on the beaches at Corpus Christi, relations between the United States and Mexico soured as both countries stood by their interpretation of the southern border. Although the United States sought the peaceful purchase of the disputed land from Mexico, the failure of John Slidell's mission to Mexico City in the fall of 1845 established that diplomacy was futile.[16] By the winter of 1845-46, it was clear that neither country would back down, and the armies of both nations continued earnest preparations for a showdown on the Rio Grande.

These preparations however, were by no means limited to the Army of Observation. While units drilled at Corpus Christi during the summer and fall of 1845, the first calls were made for American volunteers to gather for the impending war against Mexico. In July and August 1845, General Edmund P. Gaines issued orders for the assembly of four regiments of Louisiana militia and two companies of artillery to join the Army of

Observation. Shortly thereafter, he proposed the mustering of 250 battalions of mounted militia for the same purpose. Although the artillery companies assembled and joined the Army of Observation for a short period of time, Gaines's other proposals were met with disfavor in Washington, as only the Secretary of War, William L. Marcy, was authorized to make such requests, and then only with the authorization of the President.[17] Although no substantial American volunteer organizations were formed for service in Mexico by the end of 1845, enlistment in the regular army continued.

The recruits mustered into service in the last year before the war initiated a significant change in the composition of the enlistees for the Seventh Infantry in the era of the Mexican War. Unlike previous years, recruits born in the United States did not present themselves in great numbers in 1845. Beginning in that year, and continuing throughout the Mexican War, the percentage of foreign-born, five-year recruits dramatically increased, and initiated the displacement of native-born Americans as the nationality of strength, a pattern which continued among five-year recruits throughout the duration of the Mexican War, as is indicated in Table 4.4.

Although the total number of native-born enlistees decreased in 1845, most areas of the country were represented in equal proportions in both 1842-44 and 1845, with one exception [Table 1.5]. Between 1842-44 and 1845, number of recruits enlisting from the South declined slightly, while those from the Old Northwest increased slightly. This shift is easily explained, as it was most likely the result of the Seventh Infantry being moved from its southern posts prior to joining the Army of Observation. Most enlistees from the northwest joined in the latter half of the year, indicating that these men probably joined the military through the General Recruiting Service

which actively recruited in that region.[18] The origin of foreign-born enlistees exhibited little change from the established patterns as well, though recruits from English speaking countries (England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland) did display a slight increase over all others. While this might appear unremarkable considering the Irish potato famines of the 1840s, it must be remembered that the worst of the potato blights took place in 1847 and 1848, and that as late as July 25, 1845, The London Times reported that in all four Irish provinces, "an early and productive harvest was everywhere expected."[19]

An examination of the occupations of all enlistees (Table 4.7) shows that of all jobs, only the percentage of those men whose stated vocation was soldier displayed any significant change, up nearly 16 percent among all enlistees between 1844 and 1845. A breakdown of occupation based upon nativity (Tables 4.8 and 4.9) reveals the increase took place both with native and foreign-born men (up 11 and .25 percent respectively from the previous year), with most other occupations declining between the two years. While the relatively small size of this sample prevents the making of any concrete assumptions with respect to the cause of this shift, all possibilities warrant consideration, as the change which took place was significant with respect to the total number of recruits in the Seventh Infantry for that year.

Based upon an analysis of these statistics, it would appear that the prospect of war between the United States and Mexico attracted a large number of soldiers to the United States Army in 1845. With nearly half (31) of the foreign-born soldiers who enlisted in 1845 being Irish, T.B. Macauley's observation that Ireland served as "an inexhaustible nursery of the finest soldiers" certainly appears to be a possibility.[20] These "unsophisticated,

untutored, and intractable sons of Erin" had a long history of service under a foreign flag to avoid the countryside life of Ireland. This tradition was extended during the Mexican War, as Irish soldiers followed both the eagle of the United States and the snake-devouring eagle of the Republic of Mexico in the famed Batallon de San Patricio.[21] Robert Pruyn, a young musician who enlisted in the Seventh Infantry in 1845, noted the presence of foreign soldiers as he recalled the presence of "one or two Englishmen who had been in the Peninsula with Wellington, and one German who had been at Waterloo" when his recollections of the Mexican War were published in 1913. Similarly, George Ballentine, who joined the First Artillery in 1845, revealed in his memoirs that prior to enlisting in the United States Army, he had served for some time in the British Army, then donned the army blue only when other employment in the United States was unavailable.[22]

Notions of itinerant soldiers-of-fortune are difficult to verify solely through statistical analysis. However, based upon the recollections of Pruyn and Ballentine, the presence of veterans in the ranks who returned to the army later in life merits consideration. As the increases in the numbers of soldiers apply to both native and foreign-born soldiers the possibility exists that such changes could be the result veterans of the Seminole War re-enlisting after failing to find a niche in American society. Although based on speculation, this notion must be considered as a possibility, as other scholars have noted that Seminole War veterans "accounted for a disproportionately large number of recruits," in the years immediately prior to the Mexican War.[23] Other influencing factors include an increase in the number of immigrants arriving at New Orleans between 1844 and 1845.[24] Although some companies in the regiment were only there for half of the year, the

dramatic increase in new arrivals could have changed the occupational composition of enlistees in the regiment. Moreover, the possibility also exists that the increase in foreign-born (particularly Irish) soldiers could be a result of rampant nativism. However, unlike the case with the veteran soldiers as new enlistees in the Seventh Infantry, assumptions with regard to immigration and nativism require additional supporting evidence which at this time is not forthcoming. Regardless of occupational variation, the proportion of foreign-born, five-year enlistees in the regular army remained high throughout the war. After 1845, other identifiable circumstances influenced changes in occupational composition of enlistees in the Seventh Infantry, all of which, with the exception of one noteworthy series of events, stemmed from the evolution of the armed conflict with Mexico.

On 13 May 1846 Congress, reacting to news of a Mexican attack on American dragoons in the Nueces Strip, endorsed President Polk's assertion that "Mexico has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory, and shed American blood on American soil," and declared war against Mexico.[25] On the same day, all the while unaware of the Battles of Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, and the siege of Fort Brown (which took place in early May 1846), Congress passed "An Act to Provide for the Prosecution of the Existing War Between the United States and the Republic of Mexico," authorizing President Polk to enlist 50,000 volunteers to serve for twelve months.[26] This initial call for volunteers was accompanied by a rage militaire--an infatuation for all things military--which swept through much of the United States following the news of the first battles of the war. After the decisive victories on the Mexican border and the call for troops by the government, speeches, bonfires, torch light parades, and war rallies were

held to encourage enlistment in the volunteer regiments. Encouraged by patriotic fervor and peer pressure, volunteers flocked to the colors throughout the nation, and in a few short months, units had been raised in fifteen states, in a standardized organization similar to regular units, although the size of the companies was smaller. However, whereas all regulars enlisted for a period of five years, according to the terms of the act of 13 May, volunteers were given an option, as their units were raised "to serve for for twelve months . . . or to the end of the war," unless sooner discharged, a choice that eventually caused serious problems for the commander of American forces in Mexico.[27]

In addition to providing for the enlistment of volunteers, the Act of 13 May 1846 called for an increase in the size of the regular army regiments, to a total regimental strength of 1104 officers and enlisted men per regiment. Since August 1842, a regiment of infantry at full strength was made up of 10 companies, with each company made up of 4 sergeants, 4 corporals, 2 musicians, and 42 privates in addition to the commissioned officers (1 captain, 2 first lieutenants, and 1 second lieutenant). With the increases, the number of privates in each company was raised to 100, while the number of officers and staff remained the same.[28]

Recruiting to increase the regular regiments' strength was carried out in an entirely different manner than than was enlistment in the volunteer units. In June 1846 the enlisted men of the Seventh Infantry's A,B,G, and H companies were divided among the six other companies of the regiment, thus bringing the latter closer to the number of enlisted men proscribed by law. Officers thus relieved of their companies were ordered back to the United States to recruit men to fill those companies depleted by the

reorganization. Over the next three years officers of the Seventh Infantry in the United States recruited 676 men for a five-year enlistment.[29]

The foreign-born enlistees comprised the greatest proportion of new, five-year enlistees during the war, making up as many as 67 percent of the new recruits in 1847. George Ballentine, the former English soldier in the First Artillery, attested to the multi-national complexion of the American Army during the Mexican War. While not of the Seventh, he wrote of the 60 men who formed his company, "2 were English, 4 Scotch, 7 German, 16 American, and the remainder Irish." Like Pruyn, who recalled the presence of Germans and Englishmen in the ranks, Ballentine's comments support the image of an ethnically diverse army throughout most of the war. While not definitive, these accounts, coupled with statistical evidence, illustrate that immigrants comprised the majority of the 5-year enlistees in the Seventh Infantry both at the beginning and throughout the war with Mexico.[30] However, the emerging dominance of the non-native recruit raises two questions with respect to enlistment in the Army--why were the ranks of the American Regular Army so heavily dominated by the foreign born, and for native-born Americans, why was service with the volunteers more attractive than service with Seventh regiment and the regular army?

Robert Johannsen and James McCaffrey, while noting a certain multi-national character of the volunteer forces, nonetheless argued most of volunteer soldiers in the Mexican War were native-born American citizens--young men bent on glory and adventure.[31] While campaign conditions for the regulars and volunteers were very similar, it appears that at the war's outset, joining the patriotic and virtuous volunteers had more appeal to the American citizen-soldier than becoming the "automaton" and "machine" of

the dehumanizing regular army.[32] In addition to these prejudices, it appears the option of the twelve months' service as volunteers possessed greater attraction to native-born enlistees than did a five-year hitch in service with the regulars. Additionally, if killed or wounded in action, volunteers (or their widows and orphaned children) received a pension, whereas regulars received nothing, a difference cited by Secretary of War Marcy as a "decided influence on the recruiting service" for the regular army in 1846.[33]

Moreover, the years in which the United States of America was at war with Mexico correspond almost exactly with the years of the first great famine in Ireland. Consequently, the large number of Irish-born enlistees between 1846 and 1848 were undoubtedly driven to the United States as a result of the tragic events in Ireland as thousands of Irish peasants died, lost their land, and were displaced because of the destructive potato blight. During the years of the famine (1846, 1847, and 1848), Irish-born enlistees comprised more than half of the total foreign-born component in the Seventh Infantry. The preponderance in the ranks of this ethnic group corresponds closely with immigration statistics maintained by the United States government. In 1845, 1847 and 1848 Irish immigrants composed the largest single ethnic element among immigrants to the United States, with only a few thousand more Germans than Irish entering the United States in 1846.[34]

It is difficult to directly link recent immigrants from Ireland with new enlistees in the Army, though the coincidence of the famine with the sudden increase in need for soldiers allows easy inference. Moreover, given the intense anti-Irish climate in the United States immediately before the war, there was little else for them to do. In 1844 and early 1845, nativist sentiment

in the United States increased dramatically, and anti-Irish and anti-Catholic violence erupted in major metropolitan areas. Few Americans would hire Irishmen for any job, and to avoid starvation Irishmen sought enlistment in the Army, since it provided meals, clothing and shelter, in addition to a small monthly wage (and after January 1847, a 12 dollar enlistment bounty).[35] Considering the large numbers of Irishmen who enlisted in the Seventh Infantry during 1846, 1847 and 1848, it seems likely that many of their fellow countrymen joined various regular army regiments, and in some cases early in the war constituted entire volunteer regiments.[36]

While foreign-born soldiers did composed 60 percent of the wartime enlistments, the native born enlistees cannot be ignored. In 1846, 1847 and 1848, the vast majority of native-born recruits were from New England and the Mid-Atlantic states, since most officers on recruiting duty from the Seventh operated in that region. The northeastern part of the United States provided almost 80 percent of the total five-year enlistees in 1846, although that number declined as the war progressed. Nonetheless, this region as a whole provided the greatest number of recruits for the Seventh throughout the war. Most of these men were farmers and laborers, although by 1848, artisans were present in the greatest percentages. However, it must be noted that by 1848 (in fact since September 1847) Mexico City was occupied by U.S. forces. By then, few other options for military service remained, since many volunteer units had been mustered out, and "duration of the war" regulars were no longer recruited.

While the officers of the Seventh Infantry enlisted new recruits in the United States, volunteer units arrived at General Taylor's camp near Matamoras, ready to fight "To the Halls of the Montezumas." In Taylor's

subsequent northern campaign, the volunteer regiments under his command, as well as those under the command of General John E. Wool which joined him, performed admirably, and played a major role in the capture of Monterey and the Battle of Buena Vista. In northwestern Mexico, the volunteers under the command of Brigadier General Stephen Watts Kearny and Colonel Alexander Doniphan performed equally well in the New Mexico and California campaigns. Despite the successes of the volunteers in Northern Mexico, their achievements were of secondary importance when compared with the campaign into Mexico.[37]

Following the Mexican government's refusal to sign a peace settlement in the summer of 1846,the Democrat President Polk, in consultation with his cabinet, adopted a new strategy which called for an invasion of Central Mexico. Despite the threat posed by this potential political rival, Polk named a Whig, General Winfield Scott, to command the army of invasion. This army was organized into three divisions. The first and second divisions, under the command of General William Jenkins Worth and General David E. Twiggs respectively, were composed entirely of regular units, drawn prior to the Battle of Buena Vista from the forces under the command of General Taylor. The third division, composed entirely of volunteers was commanded by Major General Robert Patterson. Although all three divisions contained experienced soldiers, the regulars present in early January 1847 (as well as the new recruits who arrived in early February), were part of the veteran military establishment composed of men enlisted for five years. In contrast, the volunteers were called into service either for twelve-months service or for the duration of the war.[38]

Many of the volunteers interpreted their enlistment terms based upon the ambiguous terms of the act of 13 May 1846, and as a result generally believed that their term of service would end in May, June, or July of 1847, at the conclusion of twelve months service. Consequently General Scott, after taking Vera Cruz in March, soon faced the prospect of advancing in enemy territory against a numerically superior force with an army soon reduced by one third. On 4 May 1847 these fears were realized as seven of General Scott's eleven volunteer regiments (about 4000 men) were discharged after twelve months of service. The loss of large numbers of soldiers in the middle of the campaign in Central Mexico made it necessary to replace these men as well as those regulars whose five-year term of enlistment had expired.[39]

General Scott's difficulties with respect to manpower had already been considered by Congress, as on 11 January 1847 it passed an act which would "encourage enlistments in the regular army." The passage of this act gave potential enlistees a choice of their term of service: either for the length of the war, or for five years, with the ultimate choice left to their option. The following month, the "Ten Regiment Bill" was passed, raising nine additional regiments of infantry, and one of dragoons to serve for the duration of the war, with officers to be appointed by the President. As a further incentive, a twelve dollar bounty was offered to all new recruits in the regular army. An additional proviso was attached to the bill which provided additional inducements for military service, stipulating that "each noncommissioned officer, musician, or private enlisted in the regular army who served a period of not less than 12 months during the war with Mexico . . . shall be entitled to receive a warrant from the War Department for the

quantity of 160 acres of land or 100 dollars in scrip" while those serving for less than twelve months would receive 40 acres or 25 dollars.[40]

Thousands of men opted to serve "for the duration of the war," in one of the ten companies raised as part of the "new establishment." The eight regiments of infantry, one of voltigeurs (mounted infantry), and one of dragoons performed admirably both in the campaigns of General Scott as well is in the occupation of Mexico. The appointment of men to command these regiments allowed President Polk to place men favorable to him in military positions in order to more effectively exert control over the army, as well as obtain the hoped-for Democratic war hero as a presidential candidate in the 1848 election--a goal of the President's since the earliest threat of hostilities.[41] At the same time, the added bonuses for service included in the acts of Congress provided a flow of much-needed recruits for the Seventh Infantry and other regiments of the "old establishment," which by that time were well understrength due to casualties and illness suffered on campaign in Central Mexico.[42] Under these acts, 534 men (over one-half of the authorized strength of the regiment) joined the Seventh Infantry for the duration of the war, and were discharged in August 1848. The introduction of these short-term enlistees dramatically altered the composition of the regiment, as their ethnic and occupational make-up was dramatically different from the men who had enlisted for a period of five years. Moreover, the compositional differences between these two groups provide greater insight as to what motivated different types of men to enlist in the regular army during the Mexican War.

The greatest number of recruits enrolled for the duration of the war under the acts of January and February 1847 were native-born Americans (61

percent) present on a scale which equaled or exceeded the pre-war percentages of 1844. These men were primarily artisans, and while it is difficult to categorize these individuals on a class level, they were undoubtedly individuals unable to find employment elsewhere, yet were undoubtedly drawn from a somewhat more respectable background, whereas earlier enlistees were predominantly displaced farmers and laborers. With few volunteer units being raised during the latter half of the war the 160 acre land bounty and the 12 dollar bounty issued to all new recruits made military service attractive to American men in numbers greater than before. No doubt many men, both native and foreign-born, overlooked prejudices against the regular army and mercenarily joined for the remainder of the war, anticipating economic advancement at its conclusion.

Although native-born soldiers dominated the ranks, foreign-born soldiers were still present, though in decreased numbers when compared with the five-year enlistees of 1846, 1847 and 1848. Irish-born soldiers no longer prevailed among the foreign-born, as German-born soldiers were represented in the greatest numbers following the great German migrations of the mid-1840s. The trend, coupled with the continued dominance of the Irish as five-year enlistees, lends credence to the notion that Irishmen sought military service as a career whereas other immigrant groups, not subject to nativist discrimination, simply saw the army as temporary employment. As with native-born enlistees, laborers were pushed aside, as artisans emerged as the occupational group with the greatest representation. This shift from farmer and laborer to artisan suggests that those who joined for the duration of the war, both native and foreign-born were <u>not</u> drawn from the ranks of the poorest, the most unfortunate, and the least productive

men in American society. Instead, those who joined under the provisions designed to swell the ranks were of a slightly higher social status than those who joined the Seventh Infantry for a five year term of service, and as a result of the land grants offered, undoubtedly viewed the army as a means for economic advancement after the war.

To strengthen the argument which postulates that after January and February 1847, men sought military service in the regular army for the war's duration in exchange for economic benefit at its conclusion, it is necessary to consider the both the rate of reenlistment and the rate of desertion in the Seventh Infantry. As illustrated in Table 4.10, the rate of reenlistment declined as the war progressed, as fewer and fewer men sought continued military service. Considering that the men eligible for reenlistment in 1845, 1846, 1847, and 1848 had joined in 1840, 1841, 1842, and 1843 respectively, the psychological impact of service in the swamps of Florida, coupled with difficult campaigning in Mexico, was undoubtedly enough to compel them to leave the service, regardless of any bonuses or incentives that were being offered for continued service at the war's conclusion. As a result, it is understandable why the number of reenlistments in the army steadily declined throughout the Mexican War. When considered on an annual basis, the rate of desertion appears to yield similar conclusions. However, when the number of desertions are considered in light of the events in Mexico, their explanation becomes much easier.

During the first two years of the war, 86 men deserted from the ranks of the Seventh Infantry, 39 in 1845 and 47 in 1846 (Tables 4.10 and 4.11). While the regiment was stationed along the Gulf Coast for the first half of 1845, relatively few desertions (17) took place.[43] This practice of

unauthorized leave from the Army emerged as a more serious problem as soon as the Seventh joined Taylor's forces arrayed on the banks of the Rio Grande in early 1846 as a part of the Army of Observation. On 11 April 1846, Lieutenant Dana wrote that "Some 40 Irishmen have deserted and gone across the river . . . Four men attempting to swim the river to desert have been shot by our guards. One belonged to the Seventh."[44] At the same time, Mexican officers across the river from Matamoras believed that the Seventh Infantry was composed entirely of German and Irish troops, and openly encouraged desertion. Their efforts, coupled with General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna's offer of significant land awards led to the desertion of many more, both prior to and during the war.[45]

Following the landings at Veracruz in March, desertions took place, though at much lower level than the previous two years. Between March and September 1847, the period roughly encompassing General Scott's campaign to Mexico City, 23 desertions took place among five-year recruits, with 8 deserters from the duration enlistees. When the desertion statistics for these two groups are compared, it appears that the ranks of each group contained two types of individuals, as the desertion patterns are quite dissimilar. Among the five-year enlistees, the greatest number of desertions (200 or 78 percent of the total number of desertions among 5-year enlistees), took place either before or after the regiment was in Central Mexico, while the remainder (44 or 22 percent) took place in on the road to Mexico City or during the occupation (between September 1847 and June 1848). In contrast, the majority of desertions of the enlistees for duration of the war (24 or 96 percent of the total number of desertions among the duration recruits) took place while the regiment was in Mexico, with only one individual deserting

while the regiment was en route to Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, where the regiment returned at the conclusion of the occupation of Mexico. These figures suggest that duration recruits were more accepting of military service, or perhaps had something to gain from a completed term, whereas many of the five-year men were individuals who, when driven to military service by necessity would desert at the first opportunity, if not to return to society as a civilian, than to serve in the military of another nation, an idea supported by the actions of some deserters during the Mexican War.

As stated earlier, Mexican officials attempted to persuade Americans to desert to Mexico at the war's outset. In April 1846, Mexican General Pedro de Ampudia issued one such appeal to American soldiers encamped along the Rio Grande, directed specifically at foreign-born soldiers in the United States Army. He wrote:

> The Commander-in-chief of the Mexican Army, to the English and Irish under the orders of American General Taylor:
>
> Know ye: That the government of the United States is committing repeated acts of barbarous aggression against the magnanimous Mexican Nation; that the government which exists under 'the flag of stars' is unworthy of the designation of Christian. Recollect that you were born in Great Britain; that the American government looks with coldness upon the powerful flag of St. George, and is provoking to a rupture the warlike people to whom it belongs; President Polk is boldly manifesting a desire to take possession of Oregon, as he already has done of Texas. Now, then, come with all confidence to the Mexican ranks; and I guaranty to you, upon my honor, good treatment, and that all your expenses shall be defrayed until your arrival in the beautiful capital of Mexico.
>
> Germans, French, Poles and individuals of other nations! Separate yourselves from the Yankees, and do not contribute to defend a robbery and usurpation, which, be assures, the civilized nations of Europe will look down upon with the utmost indignation. Come, therefore, and array yourselves with the tri-colored flag, in the confidence that the God of

> Armies protects it, and that it will protect you equally with the English.[46]

Numerous proposals of this nature were sent across the river to the American camp, and the Seventh Infantry was mentioned by General Francisco Mejía as being especially prone to desertion, as he believed it to possess a large complement of Irish and German soldiers.[47] As a result of the publication of these entreaties in the United States, most Americans believed that deserters from the American Army were primarily Irish. These notions were undoubtedly fostered by the anti-Irish sentiment which plagued the United States in the 1830s and 1840s, and compounded by the events which took place following the battle of Contreras, where a battalion of Europeans, Americans, and Mexicans were captured by United States forces.

These American and European deserters captured in Mexican uniform were the infamous Batallon de San Patricio, or Saint Patrick's battalion, whose flag was adorned with the Irish symbols of the harp and shamrock. The regiment, officially known as the Legion de Estrangaros, or Legion of Foreigners, was organized by Irish-born John Reilly, a former member of the United States Fifth Infantry who became a Major in the Mexican Army after deserting from Corpus Christi in 1845. For many years, the men of this unit were believed to be entirely of Irish descent. However, recent studies have shown that this is a mistaken notion. Of the 127 known San Patricios, the 6 who formerly served with the Seventh Infantry serve as a representative sample of the regiment as a whole. Only 3 of these men were from Ireland, with the others listing Arkansas, Scotland, and Germany, as their birthplaces, numbers which roughly correspond with the ethnic origin of the entire regiment. Moreover, the notion that the entire regiment deserted en masse

to willingly fight for the Mexicans is also untrue, as these men not only deserted over a period of many, but many argued they were coerced into fighting for the Mexican Army at their courts-martial in 1847.[48]

Considering deserters of the Seventh Infantry solely upon nativity is somewhat deceiving, as is illustrated in Table 4.12. Based upon the information provided in this table, it would appear that at least collectively, the foreign-born displayed the highest inclination to desert, and did so in the greatest numbers throughout the Mexican War, evidence which undoubtedly shaped the opinions of those who spoke ill of the foreign-born. However, when this information is analyzed based upon birthplace, a different perspective is offered, one which paints the enlistees from the United States in a less than favorable light.

When considered collectively, desertions among the foreign-born greatly outnumbered desertions among native-born Americans at a rate of over 1.5 to 1. However, to state that individuals from foreign countries possessed the highest rate of desertions is an incorrect assertion, as is illustrated in the final column in Table 4.13. On the whole, deserters from the three countries with the greatest number of men in the ranks (the United States, Ireland, and Germany), left the army in roughly equal proportions, as the deserters composed roughly approximately 20 percent of the total number of enlistees from their respective nation. At the same time, men born in the United States formed the native group with the greatest total number of desertions, despite the fact that enlistees from the United States formed less than half of the total number of enlistees in the Seventh Infantry (both five-year and duration) between 1845 and 1848. Although it might not

be the case in the other regiments of the army, American soldiers deserted in larger numbers than any other national group during the Mexican War.

Desertions occurred regardless of whether or not combat was taking place. Although combat is the most dangerous place for a soldier in the twentieth century, such was not the case among armies of the previous century, and especially during the Mexican War, where poor sanitation, illness, and primitive medical techniques proved more deadly than the bullets of the Mexican Army. In Thomas Irey's study of military life during the Mexican War, the author stated that combined number of casualties resulting from combat, disease and exposure between 1845 and 1848 represented the highest mortality rate of any war fought by American forces prior to World War II, as in later wars, technological advances, better sanitation and improved medical science prevented many of the deaths caused by illness and saved many of those wounded in action.[49]

Considering combat casualties among the regulars in the Mexican War, Irey noted that of the 100,000 troops which were assembled during the course of the war with Mexico, 1548 fell as a result of combat, yielding a mortality rate of 23.3 per 1000 among regulars of the old establishment, compared with 10.2 per 1000 among those of the new. Among the rank and file of the Seventh Infantry, 34 of the 37 combat casualties suffered by the regiment were taken by those individuals who enlisted for five years, while duration of the war enlistees accounted for the 3 remaining deaths. Comparing these numbers to the figures provided by Irey yields more disparate results among the two groups. Among the Seventh, the combat mortality rate was 38.9 per 1000 among five-year men, yet among the duration of the war enlistees, only 5.6 per 1000 were killed in action.[50] These

differences are easily explained, as prior to the attack on Cerro Gordo (17-18 April 1847), no duration enlistees were present with the regiment. While companies A, B, G, and H (the recently recruited companies) joined the regiment shortly thereafter, it is doubtful that many of the new recruits were present in the storming parties selected from the ranks for the assault on Chapultepec, as these men were volunteers, as was recalled by Lieutenant Daniel Harvey Hill of the Fourth Artillery:

> That evening [September 12th] a call was made for a storming party from our division to consist of 13 officers and 250 men. . . As the leading storming party 'the forlorn hope' was expected to suffer very much and strong incentives were held out to induce us to volunteer. To the officers were promised an additional grade by brevet, to sergeants, commissions as second Lieutenants, to corporals, promotions to sergeancies, and to privates that their names should be borne on the regimental books forever and to receive pecuniary rewards also. I volunteered and was placed in command of the detachment from the Fourth Artillery consisting of thirty as gallant spirits as ever breathed.

Although Hill did not specify the amount of the "pecuniary reward," it is a reasonable assumption that few of the duration volunteers would give up the opportunity of losing 160 acres of land in exchange for a few dollars if and only if they successfully took Chapultepec Castle, a fortification which Lieutenant Hill viewed as "the strongest position he [the enemy] has ever occupied," manned by a force "12,000 strong with 10 pieces of cannon, the whole force being under command of Santa Anna in person."[51]

The assaults upon the fortifications outside Mexico city were undoubtedly the most costly assaults conducted by American soldiers prior to the Civil War. However, during the Mexican War, the vast majority of the casualties suffered by both regulars and volunteers were the result of illness and disease. These notion are corroborated in Table 4.14, which illustrate the

losses suffered by the Seventh Infantry (losses in excess of 80 percent). Again, the statistics offered by Irey provide a point of comparison for the Seventh Infantry, as Irey determined a casualty of 76.8 per 1000 per year for the old establishment regulars, compared with a rate of 148.8 per thousand for the new regulars. Such figures are quite different from those calculated for the Seventh, as the old regulars suffered from illness at a rate of 113.4 per 1000, while the duration of the war enlistees suffered at a rate much higher, 194.7 per 1000. Based upon these figures, it would appear that the old establishment regulars were hardier than the duration enlistees. While it is difficult to tell for certain, it appears likely that the duration regulars were constitutionally similar to the volunteers, and thus more prone to illness and disease than the regulars of the old establishment, undoubtedly a result of the lack of personal hygiene and the inability (or lack of desire) to establish more sanitary camps.[52]

Although purely speculative, the evidence with respect to death and desertion suggests that the men of the Seventh Infantry who were five-year enlistees and those who were regulars for the duration of the war, were of a different social and physical ilk. A comparison of desertion and death among these two groups seem to support such a conclusion, as is evident in Table 4.15. The desertion rate yields the most striking differences, as less than 5 percent of the duration enlistees shed their uniform and escaped from the military, while for the five-year men, the rate neared 30 percent. While the death rate yields much closer figures, it has been suggested earlier that few of the duration enlistees were actively involved in combat, hence the higher figure for the five-year men.

When this evidence is coupled with the demographic statistics discussed earlier in this chapter, the differences become more pronounced. It will be recalled that the duration enlistees were primarily native-born Americans, whereas in the four years previous, the ranks had been dominated by the foreign-born, sometimes well in excess of 60 percent. There were occupational differences as well, as the duration men were predominantly artisans, unlike the five-year men who displayed occupational variations over the previous four years.

If both the five-year men of the Seventh and the men who became Cottonbalers for the duration of the war followed the same silk colors into battle, were commanded by the same officers, and faced many of the same conditions throughout their stay in Central Mexico, why are they so different with respect to nationality, occupation, and rate of desertion and death? Perhaps because they joined the United States Army, and in this case, the Seventh Infantry, for different reasons. Prior to 1844, the majority of enlistees in the Seventh were native-born citizens. As the war began, the percentage of native-born citizens in regular service declined as many opted for a clearly defined twelve-month long term of service as volunteers. Consequently, foreign-born enlistees emerged as the dominant force in this regiment of regulars, driven to the army because of the inability to obtain employment elsewhere, the victims of nativist discrimination. The composition of the regiment changed when economic incentives, and the option of enlisting for the war's duration were offered in conjunction with the elimination of many volunteer units, and native-born Americans returned to dominate the ranks among those who enlisted for the short term. At the same time, foreign-born enlistees continued to prevail among

those who enlisted for a five-year term of service, as these men had little choice of employment elsewhere, and began to look upon military service as a career choice.

Emory Upton, in his posthumously published Military Policy of the United States, argued that the greatest lesson learned in the Mexican War was that volunteer troops, when ably supported by the United States government, could operate as a successful military force. Considering the reliance upon the militia system and the accompanying problems which plagued the United States in earlier wars, this was an important development. As a result, the Mexican War proved to be an important turning point not only in American military policy, but also in American military education, as the value of West Point training was established among the officer corps.[53]

While the changes in military policy developed after the Mexican War are important, the bonuses offered to those men who enlisted "for the duration of the war" are certainly worthy of consideration, for these bonuses appear to have the most dramatic impact upon the ethnic and economic origins of enlistees in the Seventh Regiment of Infantry during the Mexican War. James W. Oberly, in his study of public land warrants offered to veterans prior to the Civil War indicated the total size of land warrants held or sold by American veterans prior to the Civil War was in excess of 278 million acres. Although not all land warrants resulted in the physical movement of veterans, these grants were nonetheless important. Oberly indicated that the placement of these warrants in the upper midwest had profound impact on the Civil War, as they encouraged settlement in northern regions of the country, as opposed to settlement in lands gained as

a result of the war with Mexico. While a complete discussion of post-Mexican War land warrants is outside the scope of this study, they had a pronounced influence upon enlistments during the war itself, as the composition of recruits appears to have changed largely as a result of these added incentives for service.[54]

During the Mexican War, many of the traditional views of the regular forces hold true for the Seventh Infantry, inasmuch as most of the war, foreign-born enlistees composed a majority of the regiment. The dominance of the regiment by the foreign-born was the result of a number of causes, and this chapter suggests that American biases against the standing army, the option of a reduced term of service with volunteers, and hard times abroad were the most pronounced. The patriotic, adventure-seeking individuals joined the volunteers, the regulars provided an option of military service for others, and was filled by the lower classes and the foreign-born.

However, when provisions were enacted that provided more favorable terms of service and offered valued bonuses at the conclusion of the term of enlistment, the composition of enlistees changed. With the passage of the Acts of January and February 1847, large numbers of more respectable, native-born men flocked to military service. The introduction of these native-born soldiers is significant, as their presence after 1847 significantly changed the composition of the Seventh Regiment of Infantry during the Mexican War.

After seeking glory in the Halls of the Montezumas, few of the men who enlisted under the provisions of January and February 1847 remained in uniform, as they left the service, made beneficial use of their land, and fostered economic growth in the United States in the next decade. Although

some efforts were made to make military service more appealing over the next twelve years, few American men actively sought out a military career, and unless they had political connections and possessed aspirations of becoming an officer, were content to remain a civilian. As a result, by the eve of the Civil War the ranks of the Seventh Regiment, United States Infantry, would be filled with the highest percentages of foreign-born enlistees to date, a process which will be discussed in the final chapter.

# Notes

## Chapter 4

1. Colonel Joseph Plympton to General Winfield Scott, 20 April 1847, 30th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Executive Document No. 1, 286.

2. Robert Johannsen in To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 12-16, makes the case that while a portion of the War of 1812 was fought outside the territorial boundary of the United States, that earlier war was a second war for independence and does not truly qualify as a "foreign war" in the traditional sense of the word. Moreover, the Mexican War marked the first time that the people of the United States faced prolonged contact with another land with different culture and topography.

3. Ibid., 25-30, 40-41. This emphasis on the volunteers continued well into the 20th century. John Porter Bloom, in "With the American Army into Mexico, 1846-1848" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Emory University), 1956, focused on the volunteers over the regulars, attributing this to the greater number of volunteers, and the fact that they were not only more articulate than the regulars, but had close ties to a home and tended to communicate with their families throughout their term of service in Mexico.

4. George Furber, The Twelve Months Volunteer; or Journal of a Private in the Tenessee Regiment of Cavalry, in the Campaign in Mexico, 1846-7 (Cincinnati: U. P. James, 1857), 433; Johannsen, Halls of the Montezumas, 40-41.

5. Nathan Covington Brooks, A Complete History of the War with Mexico (Philadelphia: Grigg, Elliot and Co., 1849), 341-42.

6. Justin H. Smith, The War with Mexico, 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1919; reprint Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1963), 1: 208, 160, 2: 320.

7. Edward J. Nichols, Zach Taylor's Little Army (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1963), 33, John S.D. Eisenhower, So Far From God: The U.S. War with Mexico, 1846-1848 (New York: Doubleday, 1989), 35; K. Jack Bauer, The Mexican War (New York: Macmillan, 1974; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 41; John Edward Weems, To Conquer a Peace: The War Between the United States and Mexico (New York: Doubleday, 1974; reprint, College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1988), 110.

8. James McCaffrey, Army of Manifest Destiny: The American Soldier in the Mexican War, 1846-1848 (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 28-29, n. 215. In his introduction, McCaffrey cites the influence of Bell Wiley's Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Co.), 1943 and Life of Billy Yank: The Common Soldier of the Union (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1952). McCaffrey attempted an analysis of enlistment records in the Mexican War to provide some sense of the degree to which foreign enlistees were present in the American regular army. In doing so, he utilized Registers of Enlistments in the United States Army, National Archives, RG 94, Entry 89, Microcopy 233, roll 22, which encompasses enlistments between July 1846-October 1850. While this does provide a count of the men who joined the regular service during the war, the author neglected to consider those in service as the war began (contained

in roll 21, 1840-June 1846), as well as those who joined under the provisions offered in January and February 1847 (roll 23, Mexican War enlistments).

9. These regulations, initially published in 1841 (U.S. Government, General Regulations of the Army, 1841 Washington, DC, 1841), were revised in 1847 (U.S. Government, General Regulations for the Army, 1847, Washington, DC, 1847). However, with respect to enlistment, there was no variation between the two sets of regulations, and for the purposes of this study, the General Regulations of 1841 will be considered as applicable for the entire war.

10. U.S. Government, General Regulations, 1841, 119-121.

11. Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1844, 28th Congress, 2nd Session, Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 140-41. In 1844, 121 men joined the Seventh Regiment after 14 May 1844, the date on which the GRS was reactivated.

12. Bauer, Mexican War, 17-19.

13. Regimental Return, August 1845: National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 79..

14. Lieutenant Dana joined the regiment as a brevet second lieutenant on 1 July 1842, after having graduated from West Point in July 1838. Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903; reprint, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965), 1: 352.

15. Robert H. Ferrell, ed., "Monterrey is Ours:" The Mexican War Letters of Lieutenant Dana, 1845-1847" (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990), 15.

16. Ibid., 22-29.

17. Bauer, Mexican War, 19-20.

18. Registers of Enlistments in the United States Army, National Archives, RG 94, Entry 89, Microcopy 233, rolls 21-23. Evidence which substantiates this conclusion is drawn primarily from the column "Place of Enlistment" on the "Registers of Enlistment." Most of the enlistees from the South enlisted early in the year, and the vast majority of those from the Northwest did so after June 1845, and did so from midwestern and eastern cities.

19. Quoted in Cecil Woodham Smith, The Great Hunger: Ireland, 1845-1849 (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 39.

20. Ibid., 28.

21. George McCall, Letters from the Frontiers (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1868; reprint, Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1974), 334; Miller, Shamrock and Sword; Walter Power, "Facets of the Mexican War," The Recorder: Journal of the Irish-American Historical Society 36 (1975), 135-43; Edward S. Wallace "The Battalion of Saint Patrick in the Mexican War," Military Affairs 14 (Spring 1950), 84-91.

22. Robert N. Pruyn, "Campaigning Through Mexico with 'Old Rough and Ready'" Civil War Times Illustrated 2 (October 1963), 11.

23. Dale Steinhauer, "Sogers: Enlisted Men in the U.S. Army, 1815-1860" (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992), 135.

24. Between 1844 and 1845, the total number of arrivals at New Orleans increased almost 500 percent, from approximately 3,800 in 1844 to over 15,500 in 1845. Treasury Department, Immigration into the United States, Showing Number, Nationality, Sex, Age, Occupation, Destination, Etc., from 1820 to 1903 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903), 4366.

25. Bauer, Mexican War, 67-68.

26. "An Act to Providing for the Prosecution of the Existing War Between the United States and the Republic of Mexico," 13 May 1846, in John F. Callan, Military Laws of the United States, Relating to the Army, Volunteers, Militia, and to Bounty Lands and Pensions, from the Founding of the Government to 3 March, 1863 (Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1863), 367.

27. Ibid., Johannsen, To the Halls of the Montezumas, 25-39; Bauer, Mexican War, 72; McCaffrey, Army of Manifest Destiny, 18-22.

28. "An Act Respecting the Organization of the Army, and for Other Purposes," 23 August 1842, and "An Act to Increase the Rank and File of the Army of the United States," 13 May 1846, in Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 358, 369; Heitman, Historical Register, 2: 590-93.

29. Regimental Return of the Seventh Infantry, June 1846, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 79; Registers of Enlistments, rolls 21-23.

30. George Ballentine, Autobiography of an English Soldier in the U.S. Army (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1853), 35; Pruyn, "Campaigning Through Mexico," 11. The work of Edward Coffman, The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), also substantiates this notion of an army containing a high percentage of immigrants in the years prior to the Mexican War, though as his emphasis is on the peacetime army, he gives little consideration to the composition of the army either immediately before or during the conflict.

31. Johannsen, To the Halls of the Montezumas, 29; McCaffrey, Army of Manifest Destiny, 21-23.

32. Johannsen, To the Halls of the Montezumas, 39-40.

33. Secretary of War Randolph Marcy, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1846, 29th Congress, 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 66.

34. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to the Present, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1960), 57.

35. Nativism and the Irish are discussed in more detail in George Potter, To the Golden Door: The Story of the Irish in Ireland and America (Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1960), 430-50, and Dale T. Knobel, Paddy and the Republic: Ethnicity and Nationality in Antebellum America (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1986).

36. McCaffrey, in Army of Manifest Destiny, 29, noted the presence of entirely German-born companies in Colonel Alexander Doniphan's all-volunteer command raised in Missouri, as well as the all-Irish "Jasper Greens," who were raised in Georgia.

37. Bauer, Mexican War, 235-37.

38. Emory Upton, Military Policy of the United States (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904), 211.

39. Ibid., 212.

40. "An Act to Encourage Enlistment in the Regular Army," 12 January 1847, and "An Act to Raise for a Limited Time an Additional Military Force, and for Other Purposes," 11 February 1847, in Callan, Military Laws of the United States, 378-79.

41. Richard Bruce Winders, "Mr. Polk's Army: Politics and Patronage and the American Military in the Mexican War," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas Christian University, 1994), 177-79, 244-57.

42. In February 1847, 407 additional recruits were required to bring the Seventh Infantry to its required strength. By May, that number was reduced to 299. Regimental Return, February and May 1847, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, Roll 79.

43. Register of Enlistments, Microcopy 233, rolls 21-23.

44. Ferrell, Monterrey is Ours!, 40-41.

45. Brooks, Mexican War, 97-99; Smith, The War with Mexico, 1: 507; and Bauer, Mexican War, 42.

46. Brooks,Mexican War, 92-93.

47. Bauer, Mexican War, 42; Smith, War with Mexico, 1: 160.

48. Miller, Shamrock and Sword, 150-65, 173, 175.

49. Thomas Irey, "Soldering, Suffering, and Dying in the Mexican War" Journal of the West 2 (April 1972), 285-298.

50. Ibid., 293. Although 1000 men was well above the authorized strength of the regiment, the figures developed to allow comparison with the calculations prepared with Irey were developed by dividing the total number of casualties by the number of men of each enlistment type (simple percentage), then multiplying that figure by 1000.

51. George Winston Smith and Charles Judah, eds., Chronicles of the Gringos: The U.S. Army in the Mexican War, 1846-1848 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1968, 262-63. Lieutenant Hill was an 1838 graduate of West Point, Heitman, Historical Register, 1: 529.

52. Irey, "Soldiering, Suffering, and Dying," 295. As with the discussion of combat casualties, the same methods were used in the development of the figures for this comparison.

53. Upton, Military Policy, 221-22. The notions with respect to West Point are also forwarded by William Skelton, An American Profession of Arms: The Army Officer Corps, 1784-1861 (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1992), 344-45. "Lessons" similar to that of Upton were offered by Lieutenant Colonel Marvin A. Kreidberg and First Lieutenant Merton G. Henry in History of Military Mobilization in the United States Army, 1775-1945 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1955), 81-82. However, none of the analysis of the problems faced during the Mexican War made any link between the offering of land and continued enlistment in the regular army.

54. James W. Oberly, Sixty Million Acres: American Veterans and the Public Lands before the Civil War (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1990), 8-23.

# CHAPTER V

## THE "PEACE" BETWEEN TWO WARS: 1849-1860

"Considering the present distribution and employment of the army, it would be quite a misnomer to call it a *peace* establishment."

-General Winfield Scott,
3 November 1849[1]

With the conclusion of the Mexican War, the United States was well on its way to continental mastery. By the end of 1848, the territory governed, in whole or part by the United States of America stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Rio Grande to the Great Lakes. During his term in office, President James K. Polk earned the reputation as a powerful president, utilizing war, or the threat of war, as a diplomatic tool to settle territorial disputes with Great Britain over Oregon and Mexico regarding the status of Texas.[2] While the Oregon settlement simply recognized the 49th parallel as the western boundary between the United States and Canada, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, ratified on 2 February 1848, not only ended hostilities with Mexico but resulted in the cession of 960,000 square miles of northern Mexico, from which the states of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and parts of Utah, Nevada, and Colorado were ultimately formed.[3]

Rather than earning the United States Army a respite from its duties, the elimination of points of conflict between the United States and neighboring countries did not result in peace. In fact, extending national boundaries necessitated a new role for the U.S. Army, and the years which followed the statement made by General Scott were some of the busiest ever

experienced by the United States Army. As American settlers made their way westward in ever-increasing numbers and encroached upon the lands of the western Indian tribes, the United States struggled to develop new policies to maintain peace in the new territories.[4] With the discovery of gold in California in 1848, thousands made their way overland to find their fortunes in the California gold fields. Those interested in farming or land speculation sought to purchase some of the millions of acres of government land in the western territories available at modest prices. Still others desired freedom from oppression (religious or otherwise) and used the vast western expanse to create a new society. In nearly every case, westward expansion brought with it increased contact with the native inhabitants of the continent, and as always, the United States Army, and the Seventh Regiment of Infantry, were called upon to protect the lives, property and interests of the United States and its citizens in the western territories.

The United States was not the only nation making adjustments. Across the Atlantic, changing social and economic conditions fostered by the rise of mechanization resulted in disruptions of the lives of thousands of Europeans. As a result of these changes, thousands of immigrants made their way to the United States. Many would turn to the United States Army, where they would assume the role of peacekeepers in the decade before the Civil War. Yet before an analysis of the changing composition of the Seventh Infantry can be offered, it is first necessary to understand the role played by the regiment and the United States Army between 1849 and 1860.

Although the major battles of the Mexican War ended with the taking of Mexico City on 14 September 1847, the Cottonbalers remained in Mexico from the end of the hostilities until June 1848, where the regiment, with

much of the American army, formed part of the garrison which occupied Mexico City. Following a ten month long occupation, the army's regulars and the volunteers returned home as conquering heroes. At that point, no military force in this quadrant of the hemisphere could rival the returning army's discipline, training and experience. In characteristic American fashion, that victorious army did not remain together for long, and upon its return to the United States, the volunteers were discharged and the regulars were divided up and ordered to occupy posts across continent.

Judging from its exemplary performance in Mexico, it might appear that the army, heretofore alternately criticized as a threat to the republic, or as a haven for the immigrants, the dregs and the downtrodden of American society, would enjoy some change in status.[5] For the volunteers, returning like Cincinattus to the farm, shop, mill, office left behind when patriotic duty called, their arrival in the United States was heralded by hometown parades and banquets celebrating their valor and heroism.[6] In stark contrast, there were few celebrations held for the returning Seventh Infantry, which traveled by steamer to New Orleans, then on to its next post at Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, accompanied by the Sixth Infantry, Eighth Infantry, and the Mounted Rifles.[7] Upon their return to the United States, some of the men in the army blue enjoyed a return to civilian life as the army underwent a characteristic post-war reduction in force, with the discharge of the ten regiments raised for service, and a reduction in company strength (down to 42 privates in each infantry and artillery company, 50 in the dragoons, and 64 in the mounted rifles).[8] For the men who remained in uniform there was little change in their day-to-day lifestyle: reveille at dawn, followed by parade, guard mount, drill, fatigue detail, and tattoo at sunset.

There was no family but the regiment, and the only home was the barracks in which their company resided, sentiments expressed by "J.S." at Fort Coffee, as seen in an earlier chapter.[9] And as was the case prior to the Mexican War, a handful of regulars were divided among a number of forts and garrisons, with an average of less than man per mile along the 11,000 miles of contiguous border of the United States.[10]

In the years prior to the Civil War, the Seventh Infantry was not excepted from this pattern of regimental division, as over the next twelve years, they occupied no less than thirty posts confined primarily to three regions: Florida, Indian Territory, and Utah.[11] For most of the decade, the Cottonbalers were ordered to Indian Territory, where they occupied Fort Gibson, regimental headquarters for many years prior to the Seminole War, and other posts guarding the overland trails through Indian Territory. The later years were marked by service in the Utah Territory, where they reinforced those units called upon to quell the religious revolt in the relatively bloodless "Mormon War." However, before the Seventh Infantry was to occupy garrisons in the western territories, it was first needed in Florida, where the Seminole Indians continued to be a problem for the United States government.

At the conclusion of the Second Seminole War, only a handful of Seminoles remained on the Florida peninsula. Between 1842 and 1848 the few Indians who remained in Florida (primarily the young boys who had come of age since the conclusion of the war in 1842[12]), remained quiet, content to live their lives in the swamps of the Florida Everglades. Over the next six years, the whites who inhabited Florida began to make increasingly loud pleas for the total removal of the tribe. In response to their almost

constant harassment by Indian agents, the tribe responded in July 1848 by attacking a plantation on New River, followed by a raid on a trading post located on the Pease River.[13] Although efforts were made by Brevet Major-General David E. Twiggs to make peace with the offending members of the tribe, several renegades continued to make attacks on isolated white settlements, necessitating additional military action.[14]

In response to the Seminole hostilities, Colonel Joseph Plympton and the Seventh Infantry were ordered from Jefferson Barracks, Missouri to Florida on 28 July 1848.[15] Upon their arrival and report to General Twiggs, they were ordered to Forts Foster (located near a ford on the Hillsborough river) and Dade (erected near the site of the 1835 massacre), and eventually occupied Forts Meade, Hamer, and Choconikla.[16] Following lengthy negotiations with the army (which assumed the duties of dealing with the Indians following the relief of the Department of the Interior), monetary inducements were offered for voluntary removal from Florida.[17] Despite the 500 dollars offered for each man or boy, 100 dollars for each woman or child who would voluntarily leave Florida, in addition to subsistence for one year, replacement of or payment for any livestock or property abandoned or lost, plus gifts and the presence of a qualified surgeon on the journey west, only 36 Seminoles were moved to Indian Territory by May 1853, and the remainder of the tribe refused to move and remained in the Florida swamps.[18] For the next five years Seminoles led by Holatter Micco (known to the army as Billy Bowlegs) clashed with Floridians and the army in numerous occasions as continued efforts were made to remove the more tenacious members of the tribe. These attempts at forced removal were ultimately unsuccessful and a number of the most stubborn Seminoles

remained in South Florida, prompting Secretary of the Interior Jacob Thompson to report in 1858 that the Seminoles in Florida had "baffled the energetic efforts of our army to effect their subjugation and removal."[19]

The conflict with the Seminoles continued well into the 1850s. However, the Seventh did not remain in Florida until the issue of Seminole removal was settled, as the regiment was ordered to return to Jefferson Barracks, Missouri on, 27 December 1850, where Brevet Colonel Joseph Plympton assumed command of the post.[20] The regiment would not remain at Jefferson Barracks for long, however. Over the next nine years, the posts garrisoned by the Cottonbalers would number many, and the men stationed at these frontier forts would number few. As William Ganoe observed, "the pitiful attempt to have a small force everywhere at once caused long journeys of immense hardship and waste of time in movement," for the United States Army in the years after the Mexican War.[21] Such references were undoubtedly made with the Seventh Infantry in mind, as in the space of less than seventeen months, the regiment was ordered from Florida to Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and finally in August to Santa Fe, New Mexico, to participate in operations against the Indians in that region. When a steamboat, laden with supplies for the regiment already en route to Santa Fe, sank in the Arkansas River, the regiment was recalled to Fort Leavenworth, from whence it was ordered in May 1851 to occupy the posts formerly manned by members of the Fifth Infantry, high on the Red and Arkansas rivers.[22]

Between 1851 and 1858 the regiment remained in Indian Territory, where they formed the garrison (either in whole or part) at Forts Gibson, Arbuckle, Washita and Towson, in addition to occupying a number of other

posts for brief periods of time.[23] Although Captain Randolph Marcy and the men of the Fifth Infantry are perhaps most well known for explorations along the headwaters of the Red River, they were responsible for the establishment of Fort Arbuckle and the road bearing the same name. However, it was the men of the Seventh Infantry who were responsible for keeping this valuable route open throughout much of the 1850s, maintaining both Fort Arbuckle and Fort Belknap, Texas, located across the Red river along the Butterfield Southern overland mail route.[24] During the next seven years, the Fort Arbuckle road and the others which passed through Indian Territory were kept open and free from Indian attacks, allowing travelers and settlers to move westward with relative ease and safety.

Although the maintenance of forts and protection of frontier roads in the Indian Territory was the regiment's primary task, the companies and officers of the regiment stationed at Fort Smith, Arkansas, between May 1851 and February 1858 formed the garrison (in conjunction with detachments of other units ordered there for refitting and recuperation) at what was considered by many to be the "mother post" for much of the southwest. Supply and communication routes emanated from Fort Smith to Forts Washita, Towson, and Arbuckle in Indian Territory, as well as Fort Belknap, and a string of posts located throughout Texas, and the quartermaster located at Fort Smith was responsible for the transportation of material and supplies to many of these posts.[25]

Shortly after its posting in Indian Territory, the regiment was saddened by the death of Colonel Matthew Arbuckle, who died at Fort Smith on 11 June 1851, after commanding the regiment for over 30 years .[26] Upon

the occasion of General Arbuckle's death, Major General Scott ordered the rendering of appropriate military honors respecting the memory of General Arbuckle and citing his "unremitted devotion to the country--a devotion that characterized his whole military career and was strikingly exemplified in his final hours."[27] With Arbuckle's death, Lieutenant Colonel Henry Wilson of the First Infantry, was promoted to Colonel and assumed command of the Seventh on 7 July 1851, a position he would hold until his resignation from the United States Army on 25 February 1861.[28]

Rodney Glisan, an assistant surgeon, stationed at Fort Arbuckle between 1850 and 1854, spoke favorably of the troops at that post (of which there were two companies of the Seventh). As was the case with much of Glisan's journal, he offered his opinion of the purpose of a peacetime army through the use of a rhetorical question: "As the troops have fought no battles since the establishment of Fort Arbuckle, it might be asked of what service they have been to the Government?" Members of Congress raised the same issues, questioning the need for so large a peace establishment. Glisan responded to his own question, and wrote, "their mere presence had the effect of impressing on the Indians the power and authority of the United States, and of vastly lessening the depredations of these nomadic races upon our otherwise unprotected frontier." In addition, Glisan noted that the troops at Fort Arbuckle had "fulfilled our treaty stipulations with the Choctaws, whose western limits we have kept free from the inroads of the lawless wild Indians," as the Choctaw were members of the "Five Civilized Tribes." But more importantly, "They [the soldiers] have also protected the emigrant population, prevented, in a great measure, the introduction of

liquor into the Indian country; and arrested, or been the means of punishing several murderers and other fugitives from justice."[29]

Aside from the functions specifically enumerated by Glisan, most of the Seventh's tasks during the 1850's were monotonous fatigue duties similar to those conducted at nearly every military garrison on the frontier: construction and maintenance of the garrison, drill, patrols in surrounding regions, and the cultivation of the post garden. However, the potential for more important actions emerged in 1857 as the Mormon religious sect in Utah openly threatened hostilities. Since the establishment of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in the late 1820s, the members of the denomination alienated those who lived near them on what seemed to be a regular basis. Driven from their original settlements in Independence, Missouri, and Kirtland, Ohio, the Mormons founded Nauvoo, Illinois, which by the early 1840s became an imposing and economically successful community. Following the arrest, conviction and death of church founder Joseph Smith at the hands of an angry mob, Brigham Young assumed leadership of the church. Although the Mormons did field a battalion of men which saw service in California during the Mexican War, most followed the lead of Young and traveled west in search of "Zion," a sanctuary where they could establish a perfect religious state free from the influence of the Gentiles (all those not members of the faith), and the control of the United States Government in the years prior to the Mexican War.[30] The religious group settled the Salt Lake Valley where, following the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, they again found themselves settled on United States' territory. While Mormon leaders sought the establishment of the state of Deseret within the United States, political

leaders in the United States became increasingly critical of the Mormons, condemning their practices of polygamy, labeling them as "outlaws and alien enemies," proposing the repeal of the act establishing Utah Territory, and threatening to place the Mormons under military rule.[31]

Responding to public opinion, the Mountain Meadows Massacre (an attack conducted by the Mormons against settlers hoping to settle in the area), and other rumored acts of violence committed by Mormons, newly elected President James Buchanan ordered 2500 troops to Utah, under the command of Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, to bring the Mormons under the control of the United States Government. To prevent the movement of troops into Utah, the Mormons adopted a scorched earth policy, destroying forage and supplies intended for the column en route to Utah. Hampered more by severe winter storms than by the Mormons delaying actions, the expeditionary force suffered greatly during the winter of 1857, necessitating the dispatch of additional forces to Utah the following year. Beginning in May 1858, a second much larger force began marching towards Utah under the command of Brevet Brigadier General William S. Harney, which included elements of the Second Dragoons, First Cavalry, Second, Third and Fourth Artillery, and the Seventh Infantry, organized into six columns.[32]

With the dispatch of Harney's forces, eight companies of the Seventh began the march to Utah, where they would join two companies already in that department, ordered to Fort Laramie, Wyoming Territory, in July 1857 to guard supplies which would needed by the forces traveling overland on the Utah trail. While service at an established garrison was almost always easier than a military campaign, the duties and conditions of the companies of the Seventh at Fort Laramie were by no means relaxed. Major Isaac Lynde wrote

in 1858: "this command is destitute of the most essential articles of clothing, such as pants, shirts, and drawers, and stockings, and there is not more than two months salt meat on hand. This deficiency is caused by the heavy drafts made on the supply for this post of clothing and provisions by the Army of Utah in passing here."[33]

Although none of the other companies of the Seventh directly contributed to the difficulties of those posted at Fort Laramie, the remainder of the regiment was soon en route to that department as part of Harney's fourth, fifth, and sixth columns, the last of which departed on 13 June 1858.[34] After a march of 105 days, the last of Harney's columns arrived in Salt Lake City, only to find that an uneasy peace settlement had been made between the Mormons and the United States Government. Although the Army of Utah would not occupy the Mormon capital per se, to ensure that peace prevailed in the Territory it was ordered to march through the city to a new post to be established 40 miles south of the Great Salt Lake.[35] The headquarters of the Department of Utah, to be commanded by General Johnston, was established at this permanent encampment, named Camp Floyd in honor of Secretary of War John Floyd. For the next year and a half, the regiment remained in Utah, where Colonel Pitcairn Morrison of the Seventh Infantry commanded Camp Floyd.[36] Throughout the remainder of the regiment's tenure in Utah, relations with the Mormons bordered on being cordial, and except for the occasional foray made by the enlisted men to nearby "Frogtown," (an assemblage of grog shops in close proximity to Camp Floyd), all was relatively quiet.[37]

By the beginning of 1860, the Mormon War had passed, with little or no bloodshed, as President Buchanan adopted a policy of relative inaction,

not wanting to disturb the balance between war and peace in the territories, specifically Utah and Kansas. In March, the troops stationed at Camp Floyd were assembled for the last time, to be shortly thereafter ordered to posts where they were more desperately needed.[38] The Seventh left Utah in late March, and August 1860, the entire regiment arrived at Santa Fe, New Mexico, where they reported to be "in a most efficient state . . . in fine health, and in most admirable condition."[39] They did not stay at Santa Fe for long, and on the eve of the Civil War, the Seventh Infantry was poised for action against the Navajo tribe, a "numerous and powerful tribe which had caused great problems for the inhabitants of the state."[40]

The duties enumerated by Surgeon Glisan, and the campaigns conducted by the Seventh in Florida and Utah provide a glimpse into the many assignments asked of the regiment between 1849 and 1860. In addition to the operations conducted by the Seventh, the other regiments of the army were sent on expeditions against various Indian tribes in Texas, Oregon, Florida, and the Arizona and New Mexico territories, while others were saddled with the difficulties of maintaining peace in "Bleeding Kansas."[41] Despite the relative difficulty of these tasks, when these are compared to the orders of the four years which were to follow, the preceding twelve years were relatively calm not only for the Seventh Infantry, but for the army as shots were rarely fired in anger. That is not to say that the duties of the military were light, however, as the aforementioned circumstances compelled Secretary of War John Floyd to comment at the conclusion of the decade: "It has been truly said that to call ours a peace establishment is a mere abuse of terms. All the incidents pertaining to an active war establishment

characterize our service throughout the year, excepting only the casualties upon the battlefield."[42]

As is usually the case, military operations are the most visible manifestation of changing military policy during any period. As circumstances changed at the conclusion of the Mexican War through the acquisition of new territory, the War Department directed elements of the army to react to, and interact with the native inhabitants of the continent. As military policy changed, so did the form and function of the army. In 1850, an act was passed providing for the temporary mounting of infantry units, and five years later, two cavalry regiments and two new infantry regiments were authorized by Congress for duty in the west.[43] At the same time, the army benefited from other developments, with the introduction of the camel for use as pack animals in the southwest (a marked improvement over the mule and wagon, according to the Secretary of War), and the technological advances in firearms production and weapons technology, as the rifle and minie ball began to replace the smooth-bore musket and the round ball, and the first breech loaders were introduced into the arsenals of the United States regular forces.[44]

These developments, in conjunction with troop movements, were the most visible signs of change in the army. However, in conjunction with these overt changes, more subtle transformations were taking place within the rank and file of the army, as the native-born soldier was gradually being displaced by the foreign-born enlistee. As recognized in the previous chapter, the closing years of the Mexican War were marked by a return of native-born Americans to military service in numbers greatly exceeding those who joined in the previous years, as young men sought economic

opportunity as a viable reason for military service in the regular army. In the five years prior to 1849, the proportion of foreign-born enlistees to native-born enlistees in the Seventh Infantry was nearly equal (49.4 percent foreign-born verses 50.6 percent native-born). Over the next twelve years, these figures would change dramatically, as developments in Europe caused a flood of new immigration to the United States.[45]

Between 1849 and 1860, recruiting for the United States Army was carried out much in the same manner as it had been prior to the war. Both a general branch (recruiting for four artillery and what would be ten infantry regiments in 1855) and a mounted branch (serving the five mounted regiments) of the General Recruiting Service were in operation throughout the entire decade, with regimental recruiting organizations sent out in later years with hopes of, "establishing an early acquaintance and sympathy between officers and non commissioned officers and their own men."[46] Regardless of form, recruiting bodies sought new enlistees who shared essentially the same characteristics as those men who joined prior to the war with Mexico, namely free white males between the ages of 18 and 35, above 5 feet 4 inches in height, healthy, sober, able-bodied citizens able to speak and understand the English language, with exceptions of height and age to reenlistees, musicians, and those who had served in the army previously.[47] Recruited under these provisions, 2,342 men joined the Seventh Infantry between 1849 and 1860. When considered on an annual basis, the regiment represented between 3.3 percent (1854) and 4.9 percent (1849, 1853, 1859) of the total force of the army, based upon the annual reports of the Secretary of War, as illustrated in Table 5.1.

In the twelve years between the end of the Mexican War and the beginning of the American Civil War, almost 3.5 million foreign immigrants arrived in the United States, nearly one million more than arrived in the previous 25 years combined. Of these, the vast majority were from Ireland and Germany (approximately 1.2 and 1.0 million respectively).[48] Lacking written accounts from these individuals, it is difficult to definitively determine their motivations for coming to the United States. For the vast majority the cause for such displacement was largely out of their control: few were genuinely unhappy with their traditional position in European society, nor did they envision America as a great land of opportunity, as would later generations. For most, emigration to America was a means to escape changing societal and economic conditions which were making their traditional way of life progressively more difficult.[49]

The worst years of the Irish potato famine were 1847 and 1848, and as noted in the previous chapter, thousands of destitute Irish Catholics made the journey to the United States in the era of the Mexican War. The blight continued well into 1849, and as a result, thousands of Irish, and smaller numbers of Germans, Scandinavians and Scots, who depended less exclusively upon the potato, began to look to America as a means to escape their present situation. Crop failures and overworked farms, coupled with the gradual decrease in the European death rate, made it progressively more difficult for successive generations to survive solely by agricultural means. The inheritance left to children by their parents became progressively smaller and smaller, making it more difficult to live. Consequently,

thousands sought emigration simply to avoid poverty and secure a more promising future.[50]

Not all the economic problems of the old world were confined to the peasant and rural classes. Though skilled tradesmen who emigrated were greatly outnumbered by the thousands of immigrants whose hopes of continued agricultural-based prosperity were shattered, a significant number of artisans also made their way to the United States. Due to differences in the rate of technological development of Europe and America, many hoped to find employment at a higher pay level in the mills, supervising laborers at jobs they once held in the old country. At the same time, technological improvements and the widespread introduction of steam power in the 1850s forced many skilled laborers from their established positions in the European workplace.[51]

Such was the case with many German immigrants. In Germany specifically, the collapse of the traditional labor system led to the development of a great rift between the master and the journeyman. According to statistics cited by Bruce Levine in his study of German immigrants and labor conflict in the decade before the Civil War, the number of journeymen in German cities increased at a much higher rate than did master craftsmen as the changing nature of the marketplace made it progressively more difficult for a skilled tradesman to compete with emerging industry. As a result, the traditional relationship between the master craftsmen and the worker crumbled, and journeymen began to live apart from the masters as the former began to be viewed as employees, rather than masters-in-training, by the latter. This role disruption was enough to compel many Germans to seek economic opportunity in the United States.[52]

Still others left as the result of political and religious disenchantment. While the number of liberal intellectuals who left Europe as a result of political upheavals in Germany and France were in the minority when compared to the peasants, artisans, and laborers, they nonetheless represent another element of the European society which became disgruntled with the Old World and sought a change in the new.

As indicated, approximately 3.5 million immigrants came to the United States between 1849 and 1860, with the vast majority coming from Ireland and Germany. Upon the arrival of most foreigners into the United States, their reception was often as bitter as the circumstances they left behind. While some politicians actively courted the immigrant vote, most new immigrants found little solace in American society, as they were perceived as a threat by the native work force, stealing the lower-paying jobs from American workers. Moreover, the dramatic increase in the number of predominantly Catholic immigrants from Germany and Ireland gave credence to the notion that the corruption believed to be present in the Catholic church was making its way into the American political system. While the anti-foreign element had been present in American politics for many years, the unprecedented numbers of foreign immigrants arriving in the United States in the 1850s crystallized these elements into the Know Nothing party, a successful third-party movement in the early 1850s. While no Know-Nothing candidate succeeded in winning a major political victory, the presence of such a party in the United States is an accurate representation of the anti-foreign sentiment present during the same period.[53]

Based upon statistics compiled in the Eighth Census, "many of the strangers [recent arrivals to the United States] at once seek the new regions of

the west, where they were found by the census enumerators in 1860 . . . a large part of them remain in the old States, and engage, not in agricultural employments, with which they were familiar, but as laborers in commercial and manufacturing cities towns and villages." Additional statistics provided in the census illustrate this fact. In New York (including Brooklyn and the surrounding boroughs), Philadelphia, and Baltimore, the three largest cities in the United States in 1860, 46.3, 31.2, and 28.5 percent of the population, respectively was recorded as foreign-born, a testament to the powerful draw of the urban environment to the immigrant.[54]

The large concentration of immigrants in American cities undoubtedly contributed to their presence in the United States Army. In 1849, Secretary of War George Crawford observed, "according to the practice which has long prevailed, the great majority of enlistments is made in the North Atlantic cities and the adjacent interior towns."[55] As noted, 2,342 men joined the Seventh Infantry between 1849 and 1860. Of these, only 22.5 claimed American nativity, with the vast majority (77.5 percent) having been born outside the United States (Table 5.4). Of the native born, New York and Pennsylvania were represented in the greatest numbers (Table 5.5), while among the foreign-born, the Irish and Germans prevailed (Table 5.6).

Regardless of the high percentage of foreign-born enlistees, it is difficult to directly link foreign immigration with military service, as the limited number of written accounts left by these individuals prevent the evaluation of their experiences on a large scale. However, considering the intense nativist sentiment which ran rampant in many American cities, it is possible to infer that many of the foreign-born immigrants were driven to employment in the military as a result of discrimination. As Americans

voluntarily or involuntarily excluded the foreign-born from jobs in manufacturing and industry, it became necessary for many, regardless of national origin, to turn to the army in order to sustain their livelihood. While such conclusions are tentative, an occupational analysis of the rank and file of the Seventh Infantry provides additional evidence favoring such a conclusion.

The occupations of all new recruits, considered on an annual basis, are delineated in Table 5.7. Considering all recruits collectively, no single occupational group dominates throughout the entire period, as laborer, soldier, and artisan all exhibited the highest proportional representation at least three times during the twelve years in question. On the whole, laborers are present in the greatest proportions throughout, reporting 35 percent when all 12 years are considered collectively. They are present in the largest numbers prior to 1855, as after that date, artisans and soldiers are most commonly listed occupation, yet only report 31.8 and 19.1 percent during the same period. If any long term conclusions may be drawn from this data, it would appear that after 1856, economic depression directed more artisans into military service, with reenlistees accounting for a large number of the soldiers present, though both were present in numbers much less pronounced than during the depression of 1819 and 1837.[56] However, it is necessary to note that the Panic of 1857 had a limited effect on military enlistments (unlike those of 1819 and 1837) as that depression was relatively short-lived and did not contribute to the dramatic surge in enlistment evident during the two earlier economic crises.[57]

When the occupations of new recruits are considered based upon nativity, the vocations of foreign-born and native-born soldiers are quite

dissimilar. Considering all foreign-born enlistees, the vast majority listed their previous occupation as laborer (39.1 percent), followed by artisan (30.5 percent), and soldier (18.4 percent), with the proportion of those listing white collar/clerical occupations, farmer, and seaman reporting less than 10 percent in each category (6.1, 4.6, and 1.3 respectively). This represents quite a contrast from the occupations reported by native-born enlistees during the same period. While soldiers and laborers were present in significant proportions (21.3 and 20.9 percent respectively), artisans made up in the greatest percentage, well in excess of 30 percent (35.8). Following behind the major occupational groups were farmers at 12.1 percent, white collar/clerical at 6.3 percent, and seaman reporting 3.6 percent.

For both the foreign-born and the native-born recruits, these occupational trends are easily explained. As indicated above, economic, political and social upheavals in Europe directed thousands of immigrants across the Atlantic during the late 1840s and early 1850s. While the vast majority of the new immigrants were "steerage passengers," peasants and day laborers from the lower classes, a significant number of middle and upper middle class tradesmen made the journey as well.[58] When these individuals are considered in light of social and economic conditions in the United States, the high percentages of foreign-born artisans and laborers in the Seventh Infantry are easily explained.

In the United States, the 1850s witnessed a change in the social structure of urban American society. In The Craft Apprentice, W.J. Rorabaugh examined the effects of mechanization upon the skilled craftsman (artisan) in antebellum America. He concluded that by the 1850s, a permanent underclass of "chronically unemployed or under employed

residents" were present in American cities. As machines devalued the work of skilled craftsmen, a large body of perpetually poor emerged, composed not so much of "steady, skillful mechanics, and sober reliable workers," but, of "mechanics of inferior character and skill, and especially the lower grades of laborers."[59] Based upon such an interpretation, it would appear that the preponderance of these artisans of lesser skill levels in American society would assist in the explanation of the presence of a similar group in the Seventh Infantry during the same period, particularly during periods of economic depression (1857 and 1858).

It is difficult to ascertain whether or not the various circumstances ascribed to both the foreign-born and the native-born enlistees accurately represent the circumstances of the rank and file of the Seventh, as few letters or diaries remain from enlisted members of the Seventh Infantry who served between the end of the Mexican War and the beginning of the Civil War. However, Assistant Surgeon Rodney Glisan, who served at Fort Arbuckle and later at Fort Washita in the mid 1850s, kept a record of his events in the service at posts occupied by elements of the Seventh Infantry.[60] While Glisan was not an enlisted man, his diary provides great insight into the status of these individuals, and provides additional evidence for the statements with respect to the status of foreign-born and native-born enlistees made previously.

In July 1853, Glisan served as Judge Advocate at the general court-martial of a number of soldiers, one of whom was named Wright, an American tried for striking his corporal. After hearing Wright's "most eloquent speech," offered in his defense, Glisan was pensive, and wondered, "Why such an intelligent American as he should have enlisted as a private

soldier?" He answered his own question, and noted "He probably, took this step in a fit of disgust at some moral or social delinquency on his part." Such a statement would adequately describe the situation of an American laborer of the "lower grade" as described by Rorabaugh. Glisan continued, offering insight into the status of not only native-born, but foreign-born recruits as well, as he explained "It is no rare occurrence for educated foreigners to serve five years' enlistment merely for the purpose of employment and support until they have obtained a better knowledge of our language; but native Americans hardly ever enter the ranks in time of peace, unless they have been guilty of some misdemeanor."[61] When considered in conjunction with the aforementioned occupational statistics, this thoughtful surgeon captured perhaps best captured the social character and condition of the antebellum enlisted men in general.

That is not to say that the social character of the enlisted men was without fault or vice. Throughout the antebellum period, the army struggled to cope with the difficulties which faced the rank and file, as the poor character of native-born recruits, coupled with large percentage foreign-born enlistees, were collectively viewed as the major problems which faced the army. On numerous occasions, the War Department attempted to affect a change in the number and frequency of desertions throughout the late 1840s and early 1850s.

As outlined by Secretary of War George Crawford in 1849, "considerable time intervenes between the time of enlistment of the recruit and his presence with his company." The majority of new enlistees joined the army in the East, and the majority of the posts to which they were ultimately posted were located in the West. Consequently, the time spent by

recruits en route from one to the other was great, and by the end of his first months of service, it was not uncommon for a new recruit to still be en route to his company. Moreover, when he was paid at the conclusion of this period, not only had he yet to do any significant work for the army, but his expenses during the same period were limited, resulting in the payment of a large sum of money at once, greatly enhancing the chances of desertion, widely considered to be the greatest single problem of the army during the antebellum period.[62]

To remedy these problems, Secretary of War Crawford proposed that a bounty be paid to all troops reenlisting in southern and western territories, "equal in sum to the amount spent on transporting new recruits to western posts, and divided throughout the individual's tenure in uniform so that he receives the greatest portion in his last year of enlistment," done in this manner for the express purpose of "guarding against desertions and promoting good conduct."[63] The next year, Congress passed such provisions, and "An Act to increase the rank and file of the Army, and to encourage enlistments," established a bounty to be paid to all reenlistees joining from western and southern posts.[64]

Although enacted in good faith, the provisions passed in 1850 ultimately enjoyed little success, as less than two years later, the recollections of Surgeon Glisan illustrate the continued presence of the very same problems which the Act of 1850 supposedly solved. On 28 March 1851, Glisan recorded an event which was undoubtedly repeated at many frontier posts. He wrote, "Since the paymaster paid the troops, on the first of the month, sixteen recruits have deserted. Only two have been captured so far . . . The penalty for desertion is very severe. As much as I dislike to see a man

whipped, it would be a satisfaction to see some of these lazy fellows severely punished. They are nearly all foreigners, and have just received from five to ten months pay, without rendering any service whatever to the government."[65]

Glisan's recollections, coupled with desertion statistics compiled for the Seventh Infantry, illustrate that the act of 1850 had little overall effect. While an increased number of reenlistments did in fact take place after the passage of this provision, when the desertion rate and the time in service prior to the first desertion are considered, desertions continued to take place at a number in excess of 10 percent, and continued to take place early in a soldier's term of service, regardless of any inducements offered (Tables 5.10 and 5.11). Moreover, more desertions (104 or 21.2 percent of the regimental strength of that year) took place in 1850 than in any single year prior to the Civil War, though it is difficult to ascertain whether or not this was an effect of the provisions passed, or a consequence of the regiment's return from Florida and posting at Fort Leavenworth, as over 41.3 percent of the total number of desertions in that year took place while the regiment was stationed at that post.[66]

Because of the limited effect of the 1850 provisions, officials in the War Department deemed additional inducements and benefits for the rank and file were necessary. Prompted by the relatively high rate of desertion in the years following the Mexican War (16 percent, considering the great number of western troops who deserted after having been struck by "Gold Fever") Secretary of War Jefferson Davis offered extensive comments on the plight of the men in the ranks in 1853. Following an analysis of the desertions between 1826 and 1846, Davis observed that desertion appeared to

stem from one of two principle causes: "the disparity between the pay of the soldier and the value of labor in civil life," and "the fact that length of service carries with it no reward, either in increased pay, rank, or privilege." In Davis's view, "both these causes are the fruitful source of dissatisfaction and desertion, and they prevent the re-enlistment of the most valuable men."[67] To remedy these shortcomings, Davis recommended a number of solutions to Congress. First, he suggested that the pay of the enlisted men be raised. Second, he recommended that soldiers should be allowed pay increases for each five-year term of service beyond the first. Finally, he noted that some provision should be allowed for "promotion to the lowest grade of commissioned officers of such of the non-commissioned officers of the army as may be found qualified for . . . and entitled to, such advancement."[68]

As was the case in 1849, Congress heeded the advice of the Secretary of War and passed legislation not only establishing benefits for those soldiers who elected to reenlist in the army at the conclusion of their term of service, but also increasing the rate of pay for all enlisted men, the first time any increase in pay had been passed since 1838 (when the wages of privates were raised from 6 to 7 dollars, corporals from 8 to 9, and sergeants from 12 to 13). The act of 4 August 1854 specified that, "the pay of each non commissioned officer, musician and private of the Army of the United States shall be increased at the rate of 4 dollars per month." In addition, each soldier who reenlisted within at least one month of his discharge would be given an increase in pay of 2 dollars per month for the first reenlistment, and an additional one dollar per month for each successive five year term. [69]

Based upon comments offered by the Secretary of War, the act appeared to have great effect. The next year, Secretary of War Davis

commented, "the authorized strength of the army is 14216 officers and men . . . at the date of the last returns, the actual strength was only 10745. This difference, however, between the authorized and the actual strength of the army is fast disappearing under the operation of the law of 4 August last."[70] The next year, Davis made a similar observation, as "the recent legislation for the benefit of the enlisted men, increase of pay, with the offer of conditional promotion to sergeants etc., have been attended with the good effects anticipated, an increased improvement in the character of the rank and file."[71]

When those who reenlisted in and deserted from the Seventh Infantry both before and after the passage of the 1854 act are considered, the change brought on by its does not appear to be as beneficial as was observed by Secretary of War Davis. On the one hand, the number of reenlistments enjoyed an overall increase, when compared to the total number of men in the regiment both prior to and after 1854. Between 1849 and 1853, 50 men reenlisted in the regiment, representing approximately 2.1 percent of the total number of individuals enrolled in the regiment during the same period. In the years following the passage of the act, 239 men reenlisted, representing 5.3 percent of the total who served as Cottonbalers between 1854 and 1860, an increase of nearly 250 percent. At the same time, the overall number of men whose stated occupation was soldier increased as well. In contrast, the overall number of desertions remained the same, as for both before and after the act's passage, men left the regiment at a rate of approximately 14.5 percent of the total regimental strength (Table 5.14).

While some improvements with respect to reenlistment are readily recognizable, the statistics for the Seventh Infantry herein cited suggest that

the Act of 1854 was not as successful as claimed by Secretary of War Davis. His successor, John B. Floyd, was apparently of the same opinion, as the Secretary of War observed in 1857, "The tone of the rank and file needs elevation extremely, and every means shall be resorted to tending to effect it." Much of Floyd's comments were in regard to the role of the rank and file, and stemmed principally from the scattering of companies to far and distant posts. He wrote, "If our troops were massed sufficiently to inspire perfect drill and discipline; if they were made soldiers instead of day laborers; if a feeling of pride instead of degradation resulted from their connection with the service, the morale of the army would soon take on that elevation which is most desirable in all armies, and which certainly ought to be pre-eminent in that of a great republic." In conclusion, Floyd noted that, "If our army was put on the proper footing, the anomalous spectacle of having two thirds of our rank and file composed of foreigners would certainly not be witnessed."[72]

Floyd's primary concern was made with respect to the use of soldiers as day laborers to construct the posts they were intended to occupy, an issue raised by Assistant Surgeon R.H. Coolidge during a visit to Fort Arbuckle in 1854, when he recognized that because of the need to erect quarters, build bridges and other fatigue duties, "the number of wounds and injuries is unusually large."[73] According to the Secretary of War, work of this variety was not only "extremely detrimental to the service," as the soldiers, "feel degraded because they are deprived of both the emoluments and the sturdy independence of the laboring man who feels that his vocation is honorable because he is independent and free,"[74] but as noted by Coolidge the issue raised concerns for the general health and welfare of the man, as "the

majority are foreigners, and the larger proportion German and Irish, who know nothing of the use of the broad-ax, however expert the former may have been with the broadsword and the latter with the spade in their own country."[75]

Lacking any major combat actions, the overall number of deaths between 1849 and 1860 were fewer than the total number of casualties suffered by the regiment during the entire Mexican War. The vast majority of the casualties suffered by the regiment took place while it was posted in Indian Territory, where the infamous "charnel house" Fort Gibson, and other posts in similar climates continued to exact their toll upon the rank and file of the regiment. The garrison posted to Fort Gibson continued to be susceptible to diseases "of malarial origin, and those that engage the attention of the medical officers are fevers of an intermittent and remittent type."[76] Similar problems were present at Fort Arbuckle, though Surgeon Glisan's report noted that there were only 5 deaths in the previous 33 months prior to 1854. However, Glisan noted that most difficulties with respect to illness were suffered by those individuals "not long from a more northern and colder climate; three of them had been here a little more than a year, the other only five or six months--in fact died during the first summer's residence," a testament to the poor health of most recruits, no doubt a result of poor living prior to military service, a characteristic undoubtedly shared by the urban poor or immigrants fresh from an overseas voyage.[77]

In 1860, Surgeon Coolidge submitted a second report to the Congress, summarizing records received between 1855 and 1860.[78] While the comments offered of the individual posts are not as detailed as the previous

report, the status of the Utah Expedition illustrates many of the difficulties encountered by the army while employed in that quarter. On the whole, the effects of this climate upon the Seventh were less deleterious as the death rate dropped dramatically between 1857 and 1860, while the regiment was stationed in that region. The troops quartered at Camp Floyd enjoyed healthy surroundings, as both the water was good, and additional quantities of vegetables were supplied to the troops, preventing widespread outbreaks of scurvy.[79] The circumstances encountered by those companies of the regiment posted at Fort Bridger, were similar with respect to food, water and climate, though the presence of "a vile concoction, known as whisky [sic] . . . manufactured by traders from alcohol, tobacco, and other narcotics" was noted by Assistant Surgeon Roberts Bartholow. This elixir contributed to the only death experienced in this quarter, as "a private in company F, Seventh Infantry, having swallowed a considerable quantity of this liquor, died in a few minutes, and before relief could be obtained."[80] On the whole however, the regiment seemed to thrive in a cooler climate, a testament to the nature of the enlistees, most of whom were from the north and more accustomed to the climate of Utah Territory than Indian Territory.

By 1860, the Seventh Infantry was positioned to enforce peace in New Mexico, as Indians in that region continued to prove troublesome both for the United States Government, and for settlers who continued to move to, and through that territory. However, for the Cottonbalers and other United States regular units, the problems of the Indian would soon be forgotten, replaced by a conflict with greater purpose. In the next few years, the officer corps, and the nation, would divide along sectional lines, while only a

handful of enlisted men would desert to the Confederate States of America after the firing on Fort Sumter.[81]

Much of the loyalty of the enlisted men can be attributed to patriotism. However, the ethnic and national makeup of the United States Army must be considered as well. On the eve of the Civil War, less than 25 percent of the rank and file were born inside the United States, with the vast majority of the enlisted men in the army being immigrants who had recently arrived in recent years. Based on the sample of those who enlisted in the Seventh Infantry, less than 20 percent of those born in the United States were born in those states which would ultimately secede from the Union. Thus it is with little surprise that the enlisted ranks were not torn asunder by the sectional conflict, as there were relatively few men present with southern sympathies.

At the same time, however, the situation of the United States Army in the decade prior to the American Civil War presents somewhat of a paradox. Throughout much of the ante-bellum period, native-born Americans had little to do with the regular army. As noted during the both the Seminole and Mexican War, service with the volunteers or with the militia was ultimately more appealing to most, unless some sort of incentives were offered to make service in the regular army economically beneficial. Those who joined the regular army were usually viewed as being a part of the lower echelons of American society, unable to find employment elsewhere. Similarly, the immigrant was largely ignored by society in general, and many turned to the military out of necessity rather than conscious choice. It was however, these immigrants and outcasts from American society who, to a large degree, formed the backbone of the army which protected the "American frontier" in the decade before the Civil War.

Notes

Chapter 5

1. General Winfield Scott to Secretary of War George Crawford, 3 November 1849, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1849, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Senate Executive Document Number 1, 98.

2. Paul H. Bergeron, The Presidency of James K. Polk (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987), xiii.

3. William Addleman Ganoe, History of the United States Army (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1924), 229.

4. Robert Wooster, "Military Strategy in the Southwest, 1848-1860," Military History of Texas and the Southwest 15 ( Summer 1979), 6-15.

5. Marcus Cunliffe, Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1968), 111-26.

6. James McCaffrey, Army of Manifest Destiny: The American Soldier in the Mexican War, 1846-1848 (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 201-03; John Porter Bloom, "With the American Army into Mexico, 1846-1848" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Emory University, 1956), 289-93.

7. Ganoe, History of the United States Army , 229.

8. Francis Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903; reprint, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965), 2: 594-95.

9. Army and Navy Chronicle 2 (7 April 1836), 219, see Chapter 3, p. 22.

10. Secretary of War Crawford, Annual Report, 1849, 31st Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 180-82.

11. Regimental Returns of the Seventh Infantry, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, rolls 79-80.

12. Virginia Bergman Peters, The Florida Wars (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1979), 267-68.

13. Ibid., 269.

14. Grant Foreman, The Five Civilized Tribes (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934), 247.

15. Ibid., 248-49; Adjutant General Roger Jones to Secretary of War Crawford, Annual Report, 1849, 31st Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 183.

16. Regimental Returns of the Seventh Infantry, August 1849-January 1850, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 79.

17. Peters, Florida Wars, 278-79.

18. Foreman, Five Civilized Tribes, 250.

19. Secretary of Interior Jacob Thompson, Annual Report of the Secretary of Interior, 1858, 35th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 81.

20. General Order No. 47, 27 December 1850, National Archives RG 391, Entry 1232, General Orders, Special Orders, and Orders Issued and Received, 1842-1852.

21. Ganoe, History of the United States Army, 231.

22. General Order No. 19, 1 April 1851, National Archives RG 391, Entry 1232.

23. Regimental Returns of the Seventh Infantry, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 80.

24. William P. Corbett, "Rifles and Ruts: Army Road Builders in Indian Territory," Chronicles of Oklahoma 40 (Fall 1982), 301-03.

25. Edwin C. Bearss and Arrell M. Gibson, Fort Smith: Little Gibraltar on the Arkansas (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), 224-33.

26. Ibid., 212-13.

27. General Order No. 37, 12 July 1851, National Archives RG 391, Entry 1232.

28. General Order No. 35, 7 July 1851, National Archives RG 391, Entry 1232; Heitman, Historical Register, 1: 1046.

29. Rodney Glisan, Journal of Army Life (San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft and Co., 1874), 143-44.

30. Norman F. Furniss, The Mormon Conflict, 1850-1859 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960; reprint, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), 1-3.

31. Kenneth M. Stampp, America in 1857: A Nation on the Brink (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 200.

32. Harold Langley, ed., To Utah with the Dragoons (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1974), 12-13.

33. Major Isaac Lynde to Assistant Adjutant General, Utah Department, 24 February 1858, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1858, 35th Cong., Second Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 64.

34. Langley, To Utah, 20.

35. Leroy R. and Ann W. Hafen, eds., The Utah Expedition, 1857-1858: A Documentary Account of the United States Military Movement under Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, and The Resistance by Brigham Young and the Mormon Nuavoo Legion (Glendale, CA: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1958), 23.

36. Langley, To Utah, 87.

37. Furniss, Mormon Conflict, 205-12.

38. Donald R. Moorman with Gene A. Sessions, Camp Floyd and the Mormons: The Utah War (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1992), 272-75.

39. Colonel Thomas T. Fauntleroy to General Scott, 26 August 1860, Sante Fe, New Mexico, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1860, 36th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 62.

40. Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1860, 36th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, Vol.2, 3, 222-23.

41. Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1856, 34th Cong., 3rd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 5, Vol. 3, 26.

42. Secretary of War Floyd, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1859, 36th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc., No. 2, Vol. 2, 3.

43. "An Act to Increase the rank and file of the Army, and to encourage enlistments," 17 June 1850, and "An Act making appropriations for the Support of the Army for the year ending 30 June 1856, and for other purposes" 3 March 1855, in Callan, John F., Military Laws of the United States, Relating to the Army, Volunteers, and Militia, and to Bounty Lands and Pensions, from the Founding of the Government to 3 March 1863, (Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1863), 405-06, 429-30.

44. Annual Report of the Secretary of War: 1856, 34th Cong., 3rd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 5, Vol. 3, 22-23; 1857, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen Exec. Doc. No. 11, Vol. 3, 16-19; 1858, 35th Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, Vol. 2, 14.

45. Registers of Enlistment, United States Army, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 223, rolls 20-23.

46. Report of Commanding General Scott, 18 November 1854, in Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1854, 33rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, Vol. 1, 50.

47. Richard H. Coolidge, Statistical Report on the Sickness and Mortality of the Army in the United States, Compiled from the Records of the Surgeon General's Office Embracing a Period of Sixteen Years from January 1839 to January 1855, (Washington, 1856), Sen. Exec. Doc. 96, 34th Cong., 1st Sess., 626.

48. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to the Present (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1960), 106; Statistics of the United States in 1860, compiled from Original Returns and Being the Final Exhibit of the Eighth Census (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1866), lix.

49. Rowland Berthoff, An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 149.

50. Ibid., 154-56.

51. Ibid., 156-57.

52. Bruce Levine, The Spirit of 1848: German Immigrants, Labor Conflict, and the Coming of the Civil War (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 30-4.

53. Ray Allen Billington, The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860 (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1938), 322-23.

54. Eighth Census, lvi.

55. Secretary of War Crawford, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1849, 31st Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, Vol. 1, 91.

56. Edward Coffman, The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898 (New York: Oxford Universiy Press, 1986), 139-40, arrives at this conclusion, citing recruitment statistics and a number of official army reports. Based upon enlistment statistics of the Seventh Infantry, the same also holds true, although the Seminole War of 1835-1842 prevents the complete consideration of enlistment as a consequence of national depression, as the increase in total army strength resulted in increased enlistment in the regiment as well.

57. Douglas C. North, The Economic Growth of the United States, 1790-1860 (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961), 214-15.

58. Berthoff, Unsettled People, 154-57.

59. W.J. Rorabaugh, The Craft Apprentice: From Franklin to the Machine Age in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 132-33.

60. Glisan, Army Life, 87, 117, 142-43. On a number of occasions, Glisan specifically names officers and companies of the Seventh present at Forts Arbuckle and Washita. As few other regiments were present in Indian Territory during the same period, the probability that the individuals he discusses are Cottonbalers is high, particularly in this case, as .

61. Ibid., 120.

62. Secretary of War Crawford, Annual Report, 1849, 91.

63. Ibid.

64. "An Act to Increase the rank and file of the Army, and to encourage enlistments," 17 June 1850, in Callan, Military Laws, 405-06.

65. Glisan, Army Life, 105-06.

66. Regimental Returns of the Seventh Infantry, U.S. Army, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 79.

67. Secretary of War Jefferson Davis, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1853, 33rd Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, 8.

68. Ibid.

69. "An Act to Increase the pay of the rank and file of the Army, and to encourage reenlistments," 4 August 1854, in Callan, Military Laws, 425.

70. Secretary of War Davis, Annual Report, 1854, 33rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 1, Vol. 1, 3.

71. Secretary of War Davis, Annual Report, 1856, 34th Cong., 3rd Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 5, 228.

72. Secretary of War Floyd, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1857, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 11, 12.

73. Coolidge, Statistical Report, 1839-1855, 273.

74. Secretary of War Floyd, Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1857, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 11, 12.

75. Coolidge, Statistical Report, 1839-1855, 273.

76. Ibid., 267.

77. Ibid., 273-74. With respect to recruits, Glisan specifically noted that, "The health of recruits is exceptionally poor."

78. Richard H. Coolidge, Statistical Report on the Sickness and Mortality of the Army of the United States, Compiled from the Records of the Surgeon General's Office; Embracing a Period of Five Years, from January 1855 to January 1860 (Washington, DC: George W. Bowman, 1860), 36th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Executive Document Number 52.

79. Ibid., 299-300.

80. Ibid., 307-08.

81. Coffman, The Old Army, 205. Coffman states that of the 15,000 men in uniform in 1860, only 26 deserted.

# CHAPTER VI

# CONCLUSION

"They [the enlisted men of the army] become firmly attached to that method of life, and being often destitute of relations, they seem to view the members of the army as one great and extensive family."

J.S., an enlisted man stationed at Fort Coffee, I.T.
18 February, 1836[1]

By the end of 1860, a conflict between the Northern and Southern sections of the United States was inevitable. Although the Compromise of 1850 presented a means to settle temporarily the differences between the two sections, a series of marginally successful presidents who served in the interim preferred to preserve the status quo rather than directly address the issues which divided the two regions of the country. The election of Abraham Lincoln in 1861 prompted by the secession of a number of Southern states, and the others which would become part of the Confederate States of America left after the fall of Fort Sumter. After that event, both the North and South were openly assembling armies, and over the course of the next four years the nation was engaged in a bloody Civil War.

The Civil War was a watershed in American history. Few countries exist which have endured such a divisive conflict. In analyzing the letters and diaries left by the men who enlisted during the Civil War, both North and South, scholars have discovered remarkably similar motivations. By and large, those who joined during the American Civil War did so in defense of personal freedom and of love of liberty. Although the cultural and ideological differences with respect to slavery between North and South

were profound, the fighting men of both sections used similar language in describing what it they were fighting for, drawing upon a common heritage to justify their role in the conflict in terms first voiced by the founding fathers.[2]

Called to the colors out of such noble motivations, the men who joined the Seventh Infantry during the Civil War undoubtedly joined for reasons altogether different than those who served during the preceding 45 years. Between 1815 and 1860, few great ideological crusades motivated men towards military service. There are those who argued that the War of 1812 was a "second war for American Independence," a war necessary to end, once and for all, intervention in American affairs by Great Britain. However, others contend that the War of 1812 was an unnecessary conflict, the result of the United States becoming entangled in the wars of Europe.[3] Nonetheless, with the conclusion of that war, the duties of the army were relatively simple, and held little patriotic allure for most Americans.

Between 1815 and 1860, the United States Army was charged with the protection of national borders, the removal of those Indians who hindered expansion westward, and the task of serving as the "the sword of the republic," at a time when much debate ensued over both the need and utility of a standing army. Throughout the ante-bellum period the sword was not only rusty, but brittle as well, a result of lengthy periods of relative inactivity at a remote outpost, punctuated only by an occasional foray into western territory to force some noncompliant group (be it Indian or otherwise) to come to terms with the United States' government. Thus, it is little surprise that those men who joined the army did so more out of necessity than out of desire, resulting in a generally poor character of the rank and file, despite the

efforts of the Secretary of War to improve the character of the enlisted man on more than one occasion.

The Mexican War serves as an obvious exception to this period of ideological vacuum, as it represented the most visible embodiment of Manifest Destiny and the American desire to control the North American continent. This expansionist spirit, coupled with the desire to avenge the deaths of Americans at both the Alamo and Goliad during the Texas Revolution, as well as those men whose "American blood had been shed on American soil" in the early months of 1846, motivated thousands of men to volunteer at the war's outset.[4] However, that war was among the shortest waged by the nation, as the military campaigns in Mexico lasted less than 16 months, barely enough time to generate sustained popular support for the war effort.

With great ideological crusades lacking, why would a man join the regular army during this period? As was seen during this examination of the Cottonbalers, the Seventh Regiment of Infantry, throughout the 45 years which passed between the War of 1812 and the Civil War, conditions which accompanied army life were less than favorable. Not only was the pay poor, the food notoriously bad, and discipline harsh, but the enlisted soldier had little prospect of advancement through the ranks of senior non-commissioned officer, much less to reach commissioned status.

Focusing upon the Cottonbalers as a microcosm of the United States Army, it is possible to conclude that men turned towards the military for a variety of reasons. Some men turned to the military simply for the challenge presented by frontier life in uniform, although men of this ilk were certainly in the minority. These notions were clearly articulated by the

intrepid Charles Martin Gray, who enlisted motivated by a "romantic spirit," which "fed itself upon day-dreams of battles and sieges, of frontier adventures with 'savage beasts of prey'."[5] However, it is necessary to again stress that these individuals who joined possessing a spirit of adventure represented a very small portion of all those who enlisted. Most men joined out of much more practical motives.

In at least three periods, men were driven to the army more out of economic necessity than out of choice. During both the Panic of 1819 and 1837, men joined the Seventh in large numbers as the prospect of service in the military, which provided food, shelter, and clothing, was much more promising than unemployment, poverty, and starvation. While enlistment statistics from the latter depression are more difficult to interpret as a consequence of new enlistments required for service during the Seminole War, a significantly large enough number of new enlistments took place to warrant this conclusion. Analysis of enlistments during the Panic of 1857, the last economic depression prior to the Civil War, are much more problematic, as the great numbers of new enlistees common to the two earlier economic downturns are simply not present. Nonetheless, considering the thousands who were unemployed in northern cities in conjunction with the hundreds who enlisted in the same areas during the same period allows easy inference.

Economic troubles were not, however, confined to the United States, and those who enlisted in the Seventh Infantry out of economic necessity were often of foreign extraction. The great Irish potato famine forced the migration of thousands of Irish peasants to the United States, and as the Irish represented the single greatest national group in the army between early 1840

and 1860, it bears to reason that upon arrival in the United States, a great number of these individuals turned to the army as a means to avoid nativist discrimination. The effects of industrialization in Europe were not without their influence as well, first among the weavers and spinners of England and Scotland, and later with the laborers and workers of Germany, as individuals from these nations formed significant percentages of the Seventh Infantry between 1815 and 1860.

Affected by circumstances in both the United States and in Europe, the immigrant enlistee gradually replaced the native-born American in uniform between 1815 and 1860. While much of this increase in foreign-born enlistment was the result of discrimination against the immigrant in the workplace, a large part of this shift was the result of increased immigration to the United States. Some of these new arrivals served for multiple terms, lending credence to Surgeon Rodney Glisan's suggestion that the immigrant used the army to an end to obtain familiarity with the English language, and as a relatively inexpensive means to move westward. This Americanizing influence, coupled with nativism, serve as viable reasons for the enlistment of so many foreigners in the United States Army.[6]

That is not to say the native-born were not present in large portions among the rank and file. By and large, the American public expressed little faith in the regular establishment and viewed the regular soldier as one who would rather sell his shirt than do an honest day's work.[7] However, there were instances when economic incentives offered to the army's rank and file exercised their influence. In addition to increases in pay and bonuses offered for reenlistment, other emoluments were offered to encourage enlistments during times of war. At the outset of the Mexican War, enlistment in the

volunteers represented a much more attractive option than service in the regular army. Service with a militia or volunteer organization was for a much shorter period of time, and the idea of a democratic organization defending the nation's bulwark's was much more appealing than was service with the regulars. The result was a decline in the total number of native-born enlistees and in an increase in the overall percentage of the foreign-born. However, when significant land bonuses were offered to potential recruits who enlisted for the war's duration, military service became a more viable option to the native-born recruit.

Many authors have reached similar conclusions with respect to the status and development of the United States Army. In the first study to effectively address the social history of the army, Francis Paul Prucha, analyzing the army in the opening of the Northwest, noted that the army provided, if nothing else, "a directed labor force" which was instrumental in the opening of the region. This force was a "rag-tag and bobtail herd," composed primarily of foreign-born enlistees, with the balance provided by American "men of meager training, limited ability, and low morals," certainly not "representative of what was best in America."[8] In a later work addressing the role of the army in the opening of the frontier , Prucha expanded his earlier argument, claiming that soldiers served, with varying degrees of success, as "agents of empire" between 1783 and 1846. However, his analysis of the rank and file remains largely the same, and his poor opinion of the common soldier is fueled by evidence of widespread drunkenness and desertion among the enlisted men of this period.[9]

Addressing the role of the army after the Mexican War, the work of Robert Utley yields similar conclusions. Emphasizing the army's dealings

with the Indians between 1848 and 1865, Utley argued that the "frontiersmen in blue" played a decisive role in the civilization of the west. However, this role was often entrusted to an army of questionable quality. Not only were there officers of varying degrees of competence in command, but those men who joined the ranks during peacetime were "not of the most desirable character." However, Utley did recognize that the army performed a valuable role with respect to immigrants by "indoctrinating them in the language and ways of the new country and distributing them at the close of their enlistments along the sparsely populated frontier," much in the same manner Glisan noted earlier.[10]

Although the duties of the army were not the primary emphasis of Edward Coffman's study of the army in peacetime, his observations on the composition and condition of the regulars yield views remarkably similar to those offered by Prucha and Utley. However, Coffman contends that for most, regardless of background, "the uniform was a leveler," uniting men of different nations, occupations, and views under a common banner. While few men remained in the service for multiple terms, in the eyes of many, "the army was merely a means to a different ends."[11] Men joined the service, served for either three or five years (or deserted before the conclusion of their term), and at the conclusion of service were discharged from the army in new surroundings, poised to begin life anew.

In addressing the subject of the antebellum army from a different angle, Dale Steinhauer offered a quantitative analysis of the entire rank and file using a 5 percent sample of men who enlisted between 1815 and 1860. Based upon this sample, coupled with an examination of drunkenness and desertion in the army based upon court-martial records, he argued that

despite the presence of the soldier at the bottom of the American social scale, when compared to their civilian counterparts, they were of remarkably similar character. The greatest difference was the fact that, "the typical recruit was simply the one who was too alone in the world to fall back upon the beneficence and patronage of family and friends."[12]

Considering the conclusions offered by these scholars, what contribution does this study of rank and file of the Seventh Regiment of Infantry make to the understanding of the enlisted soldier in the army between 1815 and 1860? To a large degree, the conclusions presented in this study are similar to the conclusions of the aforementioned scholars. Throughout this period, the army was viewed less than favorably by American society. Although some men of means were present in the ranks, the vast majority of men were, at the outset, Americans of the middle or lower classes. These Americans were gradually displaced by foreign-born enlistees (predominantly Irish and Germans), who, following immigration, found refuge in the army not only as a means to gain familiarity with American society and culture, but also as a means to escape nativist sentiment present throughout the United States during this same period. As the Seventh Infantry was simply part of the greater whole, such results are not surprising.

There are, however, a few differences worthy of note. As discussed earlier, the composition of enlistments during the Mexican War experienced a significant change as native-born men, offered suitable land bonuses and shorter periods of enlistment, enlisted and displaced the foreign-born recruit which had heretofore composed the majority of the rank and file. Moreover, this study has sought to illustrate that changes in the rate of illness and

desertion can be linked not only to changing attitudes of the government toward the military, but also to the posts and encampments occupied by the Cottonbalers at a particular place and time, as the occupation of different military forts and cantonments represent space and time-specific circumstances which are lost in the analyses of the army as a whole.

Finally, this study has offered a point of departure from the traditional regimental histories, as outlined in the introduction. While this study has not avoided the campaigns, battles and leaders common to this variety of work, the exploits of the regiment are of secondary importance, and the changing composition of the regiment over time receives the majority of emphasis. While additional histories of this nature would likely produce similar results, the possibility exists that such studies, when undertaken, would expose subtle differences overlooked by broader studies, as evidenced by the variation in Mexican War-era enlistments revealed in this study.

Regardless of their origins, their previous occupations, and their motivations, those individuals who served in the Seventh Regiment of Infantry, and for that matter the entire United States Army, did not, in most cases, spend most of their lives in the army. In times of war, their contributions were obvious, as they protected the economic, territorial, or national interests of the United States, whether against a hostile tribe or foreign foe. In times of peace, their service was, in some ways, much more valuable. Stationed along the outer fringes of Anglo-American "civilization" they brought order to the wilderness, building the forts which sometimes became urban centers and clearing the trails which usually became highways.

While in the army, the men who became known as Cottonbalers adopted a common lifestyle, shared common experiences, and worked for common goals. The enlisted men of the Seventh Infantry, regardless of nationality, creed, or previous position in society, were placed on an equal footing with all other men who shared the Cottonbaler sobriquet. With the uniform as an equalizer, they joined a military family. Over the course of their term of service, and the time in the army endured by all the members of their extended military family, the Cottonbalers and their brethren performed a valuable service to the United States.

# Notes

## Chapter 6

1. Army and Navy Chronicle, 2 (7 April 1837), 219.

2. Early studies argued that the common soldier, fighting for both the Union and the Confederacy, simply enlisted and expressed little interest in what they actually fought for, best typified in Bell Wiley's Life of Billy Yank: The Common Soldier of the Union (New York: Bobbs Merrill, 1943), 309, and Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy (New York: Bobbs Merrill, 1952), 39-40. More recent studies have overturned this notion of ideological vacuum among the rank and file, and most emphasize a common tradition of freedom and liberty, based upon the idea established by the American Revolution. See Reid Mitchell, Civil War Soldiers (New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1988), 2-3, 23, James I. Robertson, Jr., Soldiers Blue and Gray (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 6-12, and James McPherson, What They Fought For (New York: Anchor Books, 1994), 4-7.

3. Donald R. Hickey, The War of 1812: The Forgotten Conflict (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 300-01.

4. James McCaffrey, Army of Manifest Destiny: The American Soldier in the Mexican War, 1846-1848 (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 33-34.

5. Charles Martin Gray, The Old Soldier's Story (Edgefield, SC: Edgefield Advertiser, 1868), 8.

6. Rodney Glisan, Journal of Army Life (San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft and Co., 1874), 120.

7. Such was the experience of a young officer named Ulysses S. Grant. Upon his graduation from West Point in 1843, he, while touring Cincinnati, Ohio in his new dress uniform, was confronted by a young boy who mockingly called out to him, "Soldier, will you work? No sir-ee; I'll sell my shirt first" as told in Lloyd Lewis, Captain Sam Grant (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1950), 99.

8. Francis Paul Prucha, Broadax and Bayonet: The Role of the United States Army in the Development of the Northwest, 1815-1860 (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1953; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 34-7.

9. Francis Paul Prucha, The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846 (New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), xvi-xvii, 324-30.

10. Robert M. Utley, Frontiersmen in Blue: The United States Army and the Indian, 1848-1865 (New York: Macmillan, 1967; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), 29-42.

11. Edward Coffman, The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 210.

12. Dale Steinhauer, "'Sogers': Enlisted men in the U.S. Army, 1815-1860" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992),391.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

Government Documents/National Archives, Washington, DC

Record Group 94: Records of the Office of the Adjutant General

Muster Rolls and Inspection Returns of Regular Army Organizations, 1821-1860 (Entry 53)

Registers of Enlistments in the United States Army (Entry 89; Microcopy 223, Rolls 14-28)

Returns from Regular Army Infantry Regiments (Microcopy 665) Seventh Infantry; June 1821-December 1861 (Rolls 64-68)

Record Group 391:

General Orders, Special Orders, and Orders Issued and Received, 1842-1852 (Entry 1232)

Federal Publications

Callan, John F. Military Laws of the United States, Relating to the Army, Volunteers, Militia, and to Bounty Lands and Pensions, from the Founding of the Government to 3 March 1863. Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1863.

Coolidge, Richard H. Statistical Report on the Sickness and Mortality of the Army in the United States, Compiled from the Records of the Surgeon General's Office Embracing a Period of Sixteen Years from January 1839 to January 1855. Washington, DC: George Bowman, 1856.

_____. Statistical Report on the Sickness and Mortality of the Army in the United States, Compiled from the Records of the Surgeon General's Office Embracing a Period of Five Years from January 1855 to January 1860. Washington, DC: George Bowman, 1860.

Cooling, Frank, ed. New American State Papers. 19 vols. (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1979.

Hamersly, Thomas H.S. Complete Regular Army Register, 1779-1879. Washington, DC: T.H.S. Hamersly, 1880.

Heitman, Francis B. Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903.

Kreidberg, Marvin A. and Merton G. Henry. History of Military Mobilization in the United States Army, 1775-1945. Washington DC: Government Printing Office/Center for Military History, 1955.

Seventh U.S. Infantry. The Seventh U.S. Infantry: A Brief Outline of its History and Roster of its Commissioned and Non-Commissioned Officers. Fort Leavenworth: Regimental Press, 1912.

Thain, Raphael. Charts of the Military Divisions, Departments, and Districts and of States and Territories, 1813-1880. Washington, DC: Adjutant General's Office, 1881.

_____. Notes Illustrating the Military Geography of the United States, 1813-1880. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1881.

United States. American State Papers. Washington, DC: Gales and Seaton, 1904.

_____. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics: Colonial Times to the Present. United States Census Bureau, 1960.

_____. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics: Colonial Times to 1970. United States Census Bureau, 1975.

_____. Department of the Army. The Army Lineage Book-Infantry, II. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1953.

_____. Department of the Treasury. Immigration to the United States, Showing Number, Nationality, Sex, Age, Occupation, Destination, Etc., from 1820 to 1903. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903.

_____. Department of War. Annual Reports of the Secretary of War, 1815-1860. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

_____. General Regulations for the Army, 1825. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1825.

_____. General Regulations for the Army, 1841. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1841.

_____. General Regulations of the United States Army, 1847. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1847.

Upton, Emory. The Military Policy of the United States. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904.

Monographs and Edited Works

Ballentine, George. Autobiography of an English Soldier in the U.S. Army. New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1853.

Bassett, John Spencer, ed. Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. 7 vols. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institute of DC, 1927.

Brooks, Nathan Covington. A Complete History of the War with Mexico. Philadelphia: Grigg, Elliot and Co., 1849.

Catlin, George. Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indian. 2 vols. 4th ed. London: David Bogue, 1844.

Cooper, James Fenimore. Notions of the Americans, Picked up by a Travelling Bachelor. London: Henry Colburn, 1828.

Forsyth, George A. The Story of the Soldier. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1900.

Furber, George. The Twelve Months Volunteer; or Journal of a Private in the Tennessee Regiment of Cavalry, in the Campaign in Mexico, 1846-47. Cincinnati: U.P. James, 1957.

Ferrell, Robert H., ed. Monterrey Is Ours!: The Mexican War Letters of Lieutenant Dana, 1845-1847. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1990.

Glisan, Rodney. Journal of Army Life. San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft and Co., 1874.

Gray, Charles Martin. The Old Soldier's Story: The Autobiography of Charles Martin Gray, Company A, 7th U.S.I., Embracing Interesting and Exciting Incidents of Army Life on the Frontier in the Early Part of the Century. Edgefield, SC: Edgefield Advertiser, 1868.

Hafen, Leror R. and Ann W. Hafen, eds. The Utah Expedition, 1857-1858: A Documentary Account of the United States Military Movement under Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, and Resistance by Brigham Young and the Mormon Nuavoo Legion. Glendale, CA: Arthur H. Clarke Co., 1958.

Irving, Washington. A Tour on the Prairies. London: J. Murray, 1835.

_____. The Adventures of Captain Bonneville, U.S.A., in the Rocky Mountains and the Far West. 2d ed. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1868.

Langley, Harold, ed. To Utah with the Dragoons. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1974.

Latrobe, Joseph. The Rambler in North America. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1835.

Marcy, Randolph B. Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1866.

Marryat, Frederick. A Diary in America, with Remarks on Its Institutions. London: 1839.

McCall, George. Letters From the Frontiers. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, Co., 1868; reprint, Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1974.

Pourade, Richard F. The Sign of the Eagle: A View of Mexico, 1830-1855. San Diego: Union-Tribune Publishing Co., 1970.

Potter, Woodburn. The War in Florida: An Exposition of Its Causes, and an Accurate History of the Campaigns of Generals Clinch, Gaines and Scott, by a late Staff Officer. Baltimore: Lewis and Coleman, 1836.

Prucha, Francis Paul. Army Life on the Western Frontier: Selections from the Official Reports made between 1826 and 1845 by Colonel George Croghan. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958.

_____, ed. Documents of United States Indian Policy. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975.

Seventh Infantry Regiment. History of the "Cottonbalers" 7th Infantry Regiment. Baton Rouge: Army and Navy Publishing Company, 1956.

Shaw, Frederick B. One Hundred Forty Years of Service in Peace and War: The History of the Second Infantry, U.S. Army. Detroit: Strathmore Press, 1930.

Smithwick, Noah. The Evolution of a State, or Recollections of Old Texas Days. Austin: Gammell Book Co., 1900.

Tocqueville, Alexis De. Democracy in America. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1862.

Todd, Edgeley, ed. The Adventures of Captain Bonneville, U.S.A., in the Rocky Mountains and the Far West, digested from his journals by Washington Irving. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961.

Viele, Teresa Griffin. Following the Drum. Philadelphia: T.B. Peterson and Brothers, 1864.

Articles

Johnson, A.B. "The Seventh Regiment of Infantry." Journal of the Military Service Institution 8 (August 1894): 427-448.

"Outline Histories of Infantry Regiments." Infantry Journal 19 (December 1921): 659-670.

Pruyn, Robert N. "Campaigning Through Mexico With 'Old Rough and Ready'." Civil War Times Illustrated 2 (October 1963): 10-15.

Studley, Hiram W. "Letter Desrcibing March to Utah in 1859." Annals of Iowa. 13 (April 1923): 611-18.

Periodicals

Little Rock Arkansas Gazette

Army and Navy Chronicle

## Secondary Sources

Books

Agnew, Brad. Fort Gibson: Terminal on the Trail of Tears. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.

Bauer, K. Jack. The Mexican War, 1846-1848. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1974; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.

_____. Zachary Taylor: Soldier, Planter, Statesman of the Old Southwest. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.

Bearss, Edwin and Arrell M. Gibson. Fort Smith: Little Gibraltar on the Arkansas. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969.

Beers, Henry Putney. The Western Military Frontier: 1815-1846. Philadelphia: privately printed, 1935; reprint, Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1975.

Berger, Max. The British Traveler in America, 1836-1860. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

Bergeron, Paul. The Presidency of James K. Polk. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987.

Berthoff, Rowland. An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Brown, Richard D. Modernization: The Transformation of American Life, 1600-1865. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.

Coffman, Edward M. The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Cress, Lawrence. Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Cullum, George W. Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1891.

Cunliffe, Marcus. Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.

Daughters of the Republic of Texas. Muster Rolls of the Texas Revolution. Lubbock: Craftsman Printers, 1986.

Eisenhower, John S.D. So Far From God: The U.S. War with Mexico, 1846-1848. New York: Random House, 1989.

Elting, John. Amateurs to Arms: A Military History of the War of 1812. Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 1991.

_____. American Army Life. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982.

Foreman, Grant. Advancing the Frontier, 1830-1860. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1933.

_____. The Five Civilized Tribes. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934.

_____. Fort Gibson. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1836.

_____. Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953.

Furniss, Norman. The Mormon Conflict. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Ganoe, William Addleman. The History of the United States Army. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1924.

Hagan, Kenneth J. and William R. Roberts, eds. Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Hamilton, Holman. Zachary Taylor: Soldier of the Republic. New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1941.

Hardin, Stephen. Texian Iliad: A Military History of the Texas Revolution, 1835-36. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994.

Hassler, Warren, ed. With Shield and Sword: American Military Affairs, Colonial Times to the Present. Ames, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1982.

Haythornewaite, Philip. The Alamo and War of Texan Independence. London: Osprey Publishing Co., 1985.

Hicken, Victor. The American Fighting Man. New York: Macmillan Company, 1969.

Hickey, Donald R. The War of 1812: The Forgotten Conflict. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Johannsen, Robert W. To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Kett, Joseph F. Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Knobel, Dale. Paddy and the Republic: Ethnicity and Nationality in Antebellum America. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1986.

Laumer, Frank. Dade's Last Command. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995.

Lemisch, Jesse. "The American Revolution from the Bottom Up." In Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History, ed. Barton J. Bernstein. New York: Pantheon Books, 1968. 3-45.

Lender, Mark Edward. "The Social Structure of the New Jersey Brigade: The Continental Line as a Standing Army." In The Military in America: From the Colonial Era to the Present, ed. Peter Karsten. New York: Free Press, 1981. 27-44.

Lenney, John Joseph. Rankers: The Odyssey of the Enlisted Regular Soldier of America and Britain. New York: Greenberg Publishing Co., 1950.

Levine, Bruce. The Spirit of 1848: German Immigrants, Labor Conflict, and the Coming of the Civil War. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.

Lewis, Lloyd. Captain Sam Grant, 1822-1861. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1950.

Mahon, John K. History of the Second Seminole War: 1835-1842. 2nd ed. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1967.

Matthews, Lois Kimball. The Expansion of New England: The Spread of New England Settlement and Institutions to the Mississippi River, 1620-1865. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.

McCaffrey, James M. The Army of Manifest Destiny. New York: New York University Press, 1992.

McPherson, James. What They Fought For. New York: Anchor Books, 1994.

Mesick, Jane Louise. The English Traveller in America, 1785-1835. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922.

Miller, Robert Ryal. Shamrock and Sword: The Saint Patrick's Battalion in the U.S.-Mexican War. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989.

Millett, Allan R. and Peter Maslowski. For the Common Defense: A Military History of the United States of America. New York: The Free Press, 1984.

Millis, Walter. Arms and Men: A Study in American Military History. New York: New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1958.

Mitchell, Reid. Civil War Soldiers. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1988.

Moorman, Donald R. and Gene A. Sessions. Camp Floyd and the Mormons: The Utah War. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1992.

Nevins, Allan, ed. America Through British Eyes. New York: Oxford, 1948.

Nichols, Edward J. Zach Taylor's Little Army. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1963.

North, Douglas. The Economic Growth of the United States, 1790-1860. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1961.

Oberly, James W. Sixty Million Acres: Army Veterans and the Public Lands Before the Civil War. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1990.

Owsley, Frank L. Struggle for the Gulf Borderlands. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1981.

Peters, Virginia Bergman. The Florida Wars. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1979.

Potter, George W. To the Golden Door: The Story of the Irish in Ireland and America. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1960.

Prucha, Francis Paul. Broadaxe and Bayonet: The Role of the United States Army in the Development of the Northwest, 1815-1860. Madison: State Historic Society of Wisconsin, 1953; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

_____. A Guide to the Military Posts of the United States, 1789-1895. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1964.

_____. The Sword of the Republic: The U.S. Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846. New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Prude, Jonathan. The Coming of the Industrial Order: Town and Factory Life in Rural Massachusetts. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Quisenberry, Anderson Chinault. Kentucky in the War of 1812. Frankfort: Kentucky Historical Society, 1915.

Rankin, Hugh F. The North Carolina Continentals. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971.

Reilly, Robin. The British at the Gates: The New Orleans Campaign in the War of 1812. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1974.

Remini, Robert. Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Robertson, James I. Soldiers Blue and Gray. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.

Rodenbough, Theodore Francis and William L. Haskins. The Army of the United States: Historical Sketches of Staff and Line with Portraits of Generals-In-Chief. New York: Maynard, Merrill and Co., 1896.

Rorabaugh, W.J. The Craft Apprentice: From Franklin to the Machine Age in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Rosenberg, Charles E. The Cholera Years: The United States in 1832, 1849 and 1866. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Rosengarten, Joseph George. The German Soldier in the Wars of the United States. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, Co., 1886.

Rothbard, Murray. The Panic of 1819: Reactions and Policies. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Sandwich, Brain. The Great Western: Legendary Lady of the Southwest. El Paso: University of Texas at El Paso, 1991.

Selesky, Harold. War and Society in Colonial Connecticut. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Sellers, Charles. The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Seventh U.S. Infantry. Seventh U.S. Infantry: 1929 Yearbook. Vancouver Barracks, WA: 1929.

Shy, John. A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Skelton, William. An American Profession of Arms: The Army Officer Corps. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1992.

Smith, George Winston and Charles Judah. Chronicles of the Gringos: The U.S. Army in the Mexican War, 1846-1848. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1968.

Smith, Justin. The War with Mexico. New York: Macmillan Co., 1919.

Skelton, William B. "The Army in the Age of the Common Man, 1815-1845." In Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History from Colonial Times to the Present, eds. Kenneth J. Hagan and William Roberts. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986. 91-112.

Spaulding, Oliver L. The United States Army in War and Peace. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1937.

Sprague, John T. The Origin, Progress, and Conclusion of the Seminole War. New York: Appleton, 1848.

Stampp, Kenneth M. American in 1857: A Nation on the Brink. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Taylor, George Rogers. The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1951.

Utley, Robert. Frontiersmen in Blue: The U.S. Army and the Indian, 1848-1865. New York: Macmillan, 1967; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981.

Weems, John Edward. To Conquer a Peace: The War Between the United States and Mexico. College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1988.

Weigley, Russel F. History of the United States Army. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Wesley, Edgar B. Guarding the Frontier: A Study of Frontier Defense. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935.

White, Leonard. The Jacksonians, A Study in Administrative History, 1829-1861. New York: Free Press, 1954.

Wilentz, Sean. Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Wiley, Bell. The Life of Billy Yank: The Common Soldier of the Union. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1952.

_____. The Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1943.

Articles

Barnhardt, John D. "Sources of Southern Migration into the Old Northwest." Mississippi Valley Historical Review 22 (June 1935): 49-62.

Bender, A.B. "The Texas Frontier, 1848-1861." Southwestern Historica Quarterly 38 (October 1934): 135-48.

Bieber, Ralph P. "Southwest Trails to California in 1849." Mississippi Valley Historical Review 12 (September 2 1925): 343-375.

Caldwell, Norman W. "The Enlisted Soldier at the Frontier Military Post, 1790-1814." Mid-America 37 (October 1955): 195-204.

Corbett, William. "Rifles and Ruts: Army Road Builders in Indian Territory." Chronicles of Oklahoma 60 (Fall 1982): 294-300.

Foreman, Carolyn Thomas. "Military Discipline in Early Oklahoma." Chronicles of Oklahoma 4 (June 1928): 140-144.

Freeman, Felton D. "The Army as a Social Structure." Social Forces 27 (October 1948): 78-83.

Gordon, George W. "The Battle of Contreras and Churubusco." Papers of the Military Historical Scoiety of Massachusetts 13 (1913): 561-98.

_____. "The Battles of Molino del Rey and Chapultepec." Papers of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts 13 (1913): 601-613.

Hopkins, G.T. "The San Patricio Battalion in the Mexican War." U.S. Cavalry Journal 24 (1913): 279-84.

Irey, Thomas R. "Soldiering, Suffering and Dying in the Mexican War." Journal of the West 11, no. 2, (April 1972): 285-298.

Kohn, Richard H. "The Social History of the American Soldier: A Review and Prospectus for Research." American History Review 86 (June 1981): 553-567.

Kurtz, Henry I. "Soldier's Life." American History Illustrated 7 (August 1972) 24-35.

Lynch, William O. "The Westward Flow of Southern Colonists before 1861." Journal of Southern History 9 (May 1943): 303-327.

McAnaney, W.D. "Deserters in the United States Army." Journal of the Military Service Institution 15 (September 1889): 450-478.

Morrison, W.B. "A Visit to Old Fort Washita." Chronicles of Oklahoma 7 ( June 1929): 175-79.

Papenfuse, Edward and Gregory Stiverson. "General Smallwood's Recruits." William & Mary Quarterly 30 (January 1973): 117-132.

Paret, Peter. "The New Military History." Parameters 21 (Fall 1991): 10-18.

Power, Walter. "Facets of the Mexican War." The Recorder: Journal of the Irish-American Historical Society 14 (1975): 135-43.

Prucha, Francis Paul. "Distribution of Regular Army Troops before the Civil War." Military Affairs 16 (Winter 1952): 169-173.

Prucha, Francis Paul. "The United States Army as Viewed by British Travelers, 1825-1860." Military Affairs 17 (Fall 1953): 113-124.

Spaulding, Oliver L. "The Thirty Years' Peace; An Interlude in the History of the United States Army." Army Ordnance 17 (January-February 1937): 218-221.

Stagg, J.C.A. "Enlisted Men in the United States Army, 1812-1815: A Preliminary Survey." William and Mary Quarterly 43 (October 1986): 615-645.

Sydenham, Alvin H. "The American Private Soldier." Overland Monthly 21 (1888): 590-599.

Thomson, Earl W. "The Army of the United Statews from 1830-1840." Coast Artillery Journal 79 (November-December 1936): 440-443.

Wallace, Edward S. "The Battalion of St. Patrick in the Mexican War." Military Affairs 14 (1950): 84-91.

Wesley, Edgar B. "Life at a Frontier Post." The Journal of the American Military Institute 34 (Winter 1939): 203-209.

Wike, John W. "Colors, Colors, Who's Got the Colors: An Episode in the History of the Seventh Infantry." Military Collector and Historian 4 (December 1952): 91-92.

Wooster, Robert. "Military Strategy in the Southwest, 1848-1860." Military History of Texas and the Southwest 15 (2 1979): 5-15.

Theses and Dissertations

Bloom, John P. "With the American Army into Mexico." Ph.D. Dissertation, Emory University, 1956.

Childress, David. "The Army in Transition: The U.S. Army, 1815-1846." Ph.D. Dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1974.

Gamble, Richard D. "Garrison Life at Frontier Military Posts, 1830-1860." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1956.

Graham, Stanley S. "Life of the Enlisted Soldier on the Western Frontier, 1815-1845." Ph.D. Dissertation, North Texas State, 1972.

Steinhauer, Dale R. "'Sogers': Enlisted men in the U.S. Army, 185-1860." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992.

Winders, Richard Bruce. "Mr. Polk's Army: Politics, and Patronage and the American Military in the Mexican War." Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas Christian University, 1994.

## APPENDIX

## TABLES

Table 2.1. Strength: U.S. Army and Seventh Infantry Regiment, 1815-1830.

| Strength | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. Army | | 7th Regiment | | |
| year | authorized | actual | authorized | actual | % of Army |
| 1815 | 12,383 | 9,413 | 820 | na | - |
| 1816 | " | 10,024 | " | 743 | 13.4 |
| 1817 | " | 8,220 | " | 528 | 15.6 |
| 1818 | " | 7,676 | " | 396 | 19.4 |
| 1819 | " | 8,688 | " | 396 | 21.9 |
| 1820 | " | 8,942 | " | 645 | 13.7 |
| 1821 | 6,126 | 5,746 | 547 | 445 | 12.9 |
| 1822 | " | 5,211 | " | 421 | 12.4 |
| 1823 | " | 5,949 | " | 468 | 12.7 |
| 1824 | " | 5,779 | " | 432 | 13.4 |
| 1825 | " | 5,719 | " | 492 | 11.6 |
| 1826 | " | 5,809 | " | 515 | 11.3 |
| 1827 | " | 5,722 | " | 495 | 11.6 |
| 1828 | " | 5,529 | " | 423 | 13.1 |
| 1829 | " | 6,169 | " | 490 | 12.6 |
| 1830 | " | 5,951 | " | 450 | 13.2 |

Source: War Department, Annual Returns, 1816-1823; Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1824-1830; 16th Congress, 2nd Session, House Document 41; 17th Congress, 1st Session, House Doc. 92.

Table 2.2: Comparison of National and Regimental Recruiting Efforts, 1815-1830.

| | Recruits | |
|---|---|---|
| year | U.S. Army | 7th Regiment |
| 1815 | - | 5 |
| 1816 | - | 18 |
| 1817 | - | 20 |
| 1818 | - | 179 |
| 1819 | - | 464 |
| 1820 | - | 446 |
| 1821 | - | 30 |
| 1822 | 641 | 36 |
| 1823 | 1,908 | 136 |
| 1824 | 2,558 | 208 |
| 1825 | 2,034 | 165 |
| 1826 | 1,325 | 70 |
| 1827 | 953 | 46 |
| 1828 | 1,358 | 179 |
| 1829 | 2,431 | 231 |
| 1830 | 1,538 | 121 |

Source: War Department, Annual Returns, 1816-1823; Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1824-1830; 16th Congress, 2nd Session, House Document 41; 17th Congress, 1st Sess., House Doc. 92.

Table 2.3. Ages at Enlistment in the Seventh Regiment, 1818-1830.

| Year | Age (mean) | Native | Immigrant |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1818 | 26.6 (143 of 179) | 26.2 (107) | 27.9 (36) |
| 1819 | 26.4 (381 of 461) | 25.9 (289) | 27.8 (92) |
| 1820 | 25.7 (414 of 446) | 25.1 (290) | 27.4 (124) |
| 1821 | 26.6 (17 of 30) | 25.4 (14) | 32.0 (3) |
| 1822 | 24.7 (25 of 36) | 24.5 (20) | 25.6 (5) |
| 1823 | 25.1 (124 of 136) | 25.0 (98) | 25.9 (26) |
| 1824 | 26.9 (204 of 208) | 26.9 (145) | 27.0 (59) |
| 1825 | 25.6 (146 of 165) | 25.1 (128) | 29.2 (18) |
| 1826 | 26.6 (69 of 70) | 26.4 (66) | 31.1 (3) |
| 1827 | 26.0 (44 of 46) | 25.2 (43) | 34.0 (1) |
| 1828 | 26.1 (179 of 179) | 26.0 (150) | 26.3 (29) |
| 1829 | 26.5 (228 of 231) | 25.3 (178) | 26.6 (50) |
| 1830 | 25.6 (119 of 121) | 25.5 (94) | 25.8 (25) |
| N | 2093 of 2308 | 1622 | 471 |

Note: The data in tables 2.3-2.15 are compiled from Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, National Archives, Record Group 94, microcopy 233, rolls 14-19.

Table 2.4. Birthplaces of All Recruits, 1818-1830.

| Year | Native-Born | | Foreign Born | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| 1818 | 103 | 74.6 | 35 | 25.4 |
| 1819 | 377 | 80.6 | 91 | 19.4 |
| 1820 | 290 | 70.3 | 122 | 29.7 |
| 1821 | 13 | 81.3 | 3 | 18.7 |
| 1822 | 17 | 77.3 | 5 | 22.7 |
| 1823 | 98 | 77.8 | 28 | 22.2 |
| 1824 | 144 | 72.0 | 56 | 28.0 |
| 1825 | 115 | 82.1 | 25 | 17.9 |
| 1826 | 67 | 95.7 | 3 | 4.3 |
| 1827 | 40 | 90.1 | 4 | 9.9 |
| 1828 | 150 | 85.7 | 25 | 14.3 |
| 1829 | 177 | 78.3 | 49 | 21.7 |
| 1830 | 94 | 80.3 | 23 | 19.7 |

Table 2.5. Birthplaces of Native-Born Recruits, 1818-1830.

| State | 1818 | | 1819 | | 1820 | | 1821 | | 1822 | | 1823 | | 1824 | | 1825 | | 1826 | | 1827 | | 1828 | | 1829 | | 1830 | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| Maine | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | 1 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.7 | 2 | 1.1 | 2 | 2.1 | 9 | .5 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | 2 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 1.7 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.6 | 2 | 2.1 | 12 | 0.7 |
| Vermont | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | 2 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | 2.5 | 3 | 2.0 | 3 | 1.7 | 4 | 4.3 | 15 | 0.8 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 1.9 | 12 | 3.1 | 12 | 4.3 | 1 | 7.7 | - | - | 6 | 6.2 | 9 | 6.3 | 5 | 4.3 | 2 | 2.9 | 1 | 2.5 | 7 | 4.7 | 8 | 4.5 | 15 | 16.0 | 80 | 4.7 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | 3 | 0.8 | 4 | 1.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 5.8 | 2 | 2.0 | 1 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.6 | 6 | 6.4 | 20 | 1.1 |
| Connecticut | 3 | 2.9 | 4 | 1.1 | 10 | 3.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 9 | 6.3 | 3 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.3 | 7 | 3.9 | 3 | 3.2 | 44 | 2.6 |
| Totals | 6 | 5.8 | 20 | 5.3 | 29 | 10.0 | 2 | 15.4 | 1 | 5.8 | 11 | 11.2 | 22 | 15.3 | 13 | 11.2 | 4 | 5.9 | 3 | 7.5 | 15 | 10.1 | 22 | 12.4 | 32 | 34.1 | 180 | 10.4 |
| New York | 4 | 3.9 | 38 | 10.1 | 58 | 20.0 | 2 | 15.4 | 1 | 5.8 | 14 | 14.3 | 19 | 13.2 | 13 | 11.2 | 4 | 5.9 | 9 | 22.5 | 22 | 14.7 | 45 | 25.5 | 16 | 16.8 | 245 | 14.5 |
| New Jersey | 10 | 9.7 | 54 | 14.3 | 69 | 23.8 | 3 | 23.0 | 2 | 11.9 | 5 | 5.1 | 18 | 12.5 | 7 | 6.1 | 2 | 2.9 | - | - | 7 | 4.7 | 7 | 3.9 | 4 | 4.3 | 188 | 11.1 |
| Pennsylvania | 34 | 33.0 | 183 | 48.5 | 89 | 30.7 | 4 | 30.8 | 6 | 35.5 | 22 | 22.5 | 38 | 26.2 | 27 | 22.9 | 19 | 28.6 | 5 | 12.5 | 27 | 17.9 | 24 | 13.5 | 14 | 14.9 | 492 | 30.5 |
| Totals | 48 | 46.6 | 275 | 72.9 | 216 | 74.5 | 9 | 69.2 | 9 | 53.2 | 41 | 41.9 | 65 | 51.9 | 47 | 40.2 | 25 | 37.4 | 14 | 35.0 | 56 | 37.3 | 76 | 42.9 | 34 | 36.0 | 925 | 56.1 |
| Delaware | 3 | 2.9 | 6 | 1.6 | 10 | 3.5 | 1 | 7.7 | - | - | 3 | 3.1 | 3 | 2.1 | 1 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2.0 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 1.1 | 32 | 1.8 |
| Maryland* | 13 | 12.7 | 23 | 6.1 | 16 | 5.7 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 5.8 | 24 | 24.5 | 12 | 8.3 | 9 | 7.8 | 8 | 11.9 | - | - | 13 | 8.7 | 5 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.1 | 126 | 7.4 |
| Virginia | 9 | 8.8 | 15 | 4.0 | 9 | 3.2 | - | - | 3 | 17.6 | 9 | 9.2 | 8 | 5.6 | 19 | 16.6 | 10 | 15.0 | 8 | 20.0 | 10 | 6.7 | 16 | 9.0 | 5 | 5.3 | 121 | 7.1 |
| North Carolina | 11 | 10.6 | 12 | 3.2 | 4 | 1.3 | - | - | 3 | 17.6 | 5 | 5.1 | 5 | 3.5 | 5 | 4.3 | - | - | 3 | 7.5 | 20 | 13.3 | 17 | 9.6 | 5 | 5.3 | 90 | 5.2 |
| South Carolina | 6 | 5.8 | 17 | 4.5 | 3 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2.0 | 5 | 3.5 | 2 | 1.7 | 3 | 4.5 | 2 | 5.0 | 23 | 15.1 | 18 | 10.2 | 1 | 1.1 | 82 | 4.8 |
| Georgia | 6 | 5.8 | 5 | 1.3 | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.5 | 4 | 3.4 | 2 | 2.9 | - | - | 4 | 2.7 | 4 | 2.3 | 2 | 2.1 | 30 | 1.7 |
| Louisiana | - | - | 3 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.2 |
| Totals | 48 | 46.6 | 81 | 21.5 | 43 | 19.9 | 2 | 15.4 | 7 | 41.0 | 44 | 44.9 | 35 | 24.5 | 40 | 34.7 | 23 | 34.3 | 14 | 35.0 | 73 | 48.5 | 61 | 34.5 | 15 | 16.0 | 486 | 28.2 |
| Michigan | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.1 |
| Ohio | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 3.5 | 5 | 4.3 | 2 | 2.9 | 2 | 5.0 | 4 | 2.7 | 1 | 0.6 | 4 | 4.3 | 23 | 1.3 |
| Indiana | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.1 |
| Missouri | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.1 | 3 | 0.1 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 7 | 4.8 | 5 | 5.3 | 11 | 16.5 | 5 | 12.5 | 1 | 0.7 | 6 | 3.4 | 5 | 5.3 | 42 | 2.4 |
| Tennessee | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 5.0 | 1 | 0.7 | 11 | 6.2 | 3 | 3.2 | 22 | 1.3 |
| Totals | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2.0 | 12 | 8.3 | 15 | 13.9 | 14 | 22.4 | 9 | 22.5 | 6 | 4.1 | 18 | 10.2 | 13 | 13.9 | 94 | 5.3 |
| Grand Totals | 103 | 100.0 | 377 | 100.0 | 290 | 100.0 | 13 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 | 98 | 100.0 | 144 | 100.0 | 115 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.0 | 40 | 100.0 | 150 | 100.0 | 177 | 100.0 | 94 | 100.0 | 1685 | 100.0 |

*includes Washington, DC

Table 2.6. Birthplaces of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1818-1822

| Country | 1818 | 1819 | 1820 | 1821 | 1822 | 1823 | 1824 | 1825 | 1826 | 1827 | 1828 | 1829 | 1830 | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) | N(%) |
| England | 6 17.3 | 14 15.4 | 19 15.6 | - - | 3 60.0 | 3 10.7 | 11 16.0 | 4 26.7 | 1 33.3 | - - | 1 4.0 | 9 18.4 | 1 4.3 | 72 15.7 |
| Scotland | 1 2.8 | 4 4.4 | 3 2.6 | - - | - - | 2 7.1 | 5 8.9 | 1 6.7 | - - | - - | 4 16.0 | 8 16.4 | 6 26.2 | 34 7.4 |
| Wales | - - | 1 1.1 | 1 8.0 | - - | - - | 1 3.6 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 3 0.6 |
| Ireland | 19 54.4 | 53 58.2 | 73 59.8 | 2 66.6 | 1 20.0 | 18 64.3 | 33 58.9 | 7 46.7 | 2 66.6 | 1 25.0 | 17 68.0 | 27 55.1 | 12 52.2 | 265 58.2 |
| Holland | 1 2.8 | 3 3.3 | 2 1.6 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 6 1.3 |
| Switzerland | 1 2.8 | - - | 7 5.7 | - - | - - | - - | 1 1.8 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 9 1.9 |
| Germany | 4 11.5 | 8 8.8 | 7 5.7 | 1 33.3 | - - | 1 3.6 | 3 5.4 | 1 6.7 | - - | - - | 1 4.0 | 2 4.1 | - - | 28 6.1 |
| Poland | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 2 13.2 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 2 0.4 |
| France | 1 2.8 | 5 5.5 | 5 4.2 | - - | - - | - - | 1 1.8 | - - | - - | - - | 2 8.0 | 1 2.0 | - - | 15 3.3 |
| Spain | 1 2.8 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 1 0.2 |
| Italy | - - | - - | 1 0.8 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 1 0.2 |
| Norway | 1 2.8 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 1 2.0 | - - | 2 0.4 |
| Sweden | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 1 4.3 | 1 0.2 |
| Canada | - - | 2 2.2 | 2 1.6 | - - | 1 20.0 | 2 7.1 | - - | - - | - - | 2 50.0 | - - | 1 2.0 | 3 13.0 | 13 2.8 |
| West Indies | - - | 1 1.1 | 2 1.6 | - - | - - | 1 3.6 | - - | - - | - - | 1 25.0 | - - | - - | - - | 5 1.1 |
| Other | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 2 3.6 | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | - - | 2 0.4 |
| Totals | 35 100.0 | 91 100.0 | 122 100.0 | 3 100.0 | 5 100.0 | 28 100.0 | 56 100.0 | 15 100.0 | 3 100.0 | 4 100.0 | 25 100.0 | 49 100.0 | 23 100.0 | 459 100.0 |

Table 2.7. Occupations of All Recruits, 1818-1830.

| Occupation | 1818 | | 1819 | | 1820 | | 1821 | | 1822 | | 1823 | | 1824 | | 1825 | | 1826 | | 1827 | | 1828 | | 1829 | | 1830 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 15 | 10.6 | 62 | 16.5 | 104 | 25.5 | 3 | 18.8 | 2 | 8.3 | 22 | 18.5 | 53 | 26.5 | 49 | 35.0 | 22 | 31.5 | 13 | 29.5 | 34 | 18.9 | 36 | 16.0 | 22 | 19.5 | 437 | 21.0 |
| Farmer | 46 | 32.6 | 77 | 20.5 | 44 | 10.8 | 1 | 6.2 | 10 | 41.7 | 26 | 21.8 | 30 | 15.0 | 24 | 17.1 | 14 | 20.0 | 10 | 22.7 | 50 | 27.9 | 57 | 25.2 | 34 | 28.6 | 423 | 20.5 |
| Soldier | 18 | 12.8 | 31 | 8.2 | 40 | 9.8 | 2 | 12.5 | 2 | 8.3 | 13 | 10.9 | 17 | 8.5 | 18 | 12.9 | 5 | 7.1 | 4 | 9.1 | 26 | 14.5 | 47 | 20.8 | 32 | 26.9 | 255 | 12.4 |
| Seaman | 2 | 1.4 | 17 | 5.4 | 19 | 4.7 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.7 | 9 | 4.5 | 5 | 3.6 | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 1.3 | 5 | 4.2 | 63 | 3.1 |
| Artisan | 57 | 40.5 | 166 | 44.1 | 170 | 41.7 | 8 | 50.0 | 9 | 37.5 | 44 | 37.0 | 80 | 40.0 | 39 | 27.8 | 23 | 32.9 | 16 | 36.4 | 64 | 35.8 | 73 | 32.3 | 24 | 20.1 | 773 | 37.6 |
| Other | 3 | 2.1 | 23 | 6.2 | 31 | 7.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 4.2 | 12 | 10.1 | 11 | 5.5 | 5 | 3.6 | 5 | 7.1 | 1 | 2.3 | 5 | 2.8 | 10 | 4.4 | 2 | 1.7 | 111 | 5.4 |
| Total | 141 | 100.0 | 376 | 100.0 | 408 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 24 | 100.0 | 119 | 100.0 | 200 | 100.0 | 140 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 179 | 100.0 | 226 | 100.0 | 119 | 100.0 | 2062 | 100.0 |

Table 2.8. Occupations of Native-Born Recruits, 1818-1830.

| Occupation | 1818 | | 1819 | | 1820 | | 1821 | | 1822 | | 1823 | | 1824 | | 1825 | | 1826 | | 1827 | | 1828 | | 1829 | | 1830 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 12 | 11.9 | 37 | 13.0 | 64 | 22.4 | 3 | 25.0 | 2 | 8.7 | 13 | 14.3 | 30 | 21.1 | 44 | 36.4 | 22 | 32.8 | 13 | 29.6 | 24 | 16.0 | 24 | 13.6 | 11 | 11.7 | 299 | 18.8 |
| Farmer | 33 | 32.7 | 69 | 24.4 | 28 | 9.8 | 1 | 8.3 | 9 | 39.1 | 22 | 24.1 | 25 | 17.6 | 23 | 19.0 | 13 | 19.4 | 10 | 22.7 | 50 | 33.3 | 54 | 30.5 | 31 | 33.0 | 368 | 23.1 |
| Soldier | 9 | 8.9 | 17 | 6.1 | 29 | 10.2 | 1 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.7 | 12 | 13.2 | 11 | 7.7 | 11 | 9.1 | 5 | 7.5 | 4 | 9.0 | 20 | 13.3 | 30 | 16.9 | 29 | 29.8 | 180 | 11.3 |
| Seaman | 1 | 0.9 | 11 | 3.9 | 17 | 5.9 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2.2 | 8 | 5.6 | 4 | 3.3 | 1 | 1.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | 3 | 3.2 | 48 | 3.0 |
| Artisan | 46 | 45.6 | 141 | 49.8 | 139 | 48.6 | 7 | 58.4 | 10 | 43.5 | 42 | 46.2 | 68 | 47.9 | 39 | 32.2 | 23 | 34.3 | 16 | 36.4 | 54 | 36.0 | 65 | 36.7 | 21 | 22.3 | 671 | 42.2 |
| Other | - | - | 8 | 2.8 | 9 | 3.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 4.5 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 | 1.4 | 3 | 1.7 | - | - | 26 | 1.6 |
| Total | 101 | 100.0 | 283 | 100.0 | 286 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 | 91 | 100.0 | 142 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 150 | 100.0 | 177 | 100.0 | 95 | 100.0 | 1592 | 100.0 |

Table 2.9. Occupations of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1818-1830.

| Occupation | 1818 | | 1819 | | 1820 | | 1821 | | 1822 | | 1823 | | 1824 | | 1825 | | 1826 | | 1827 | | 1828 | | 1829 | | 1830 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 3 | 8.3 | 24 | 26.9 | 40 | 32.8 | - | - | 1 | 20.0 | 93 | 39.2 | 23 | 40.3 | 5 | 29.4 | - | - | - | - | 9 | 32.2 | 12 | 24.5 | 11 | 44.0 | 221 | 40.8 |
| Farmer | 12 | 33.3 | 8 | 8.9 | 16 | 13.1 | 2 | 40.0 | 4 | 17.4 | 5 | 8.7 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 33.3 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 6.1 | 3 | 12.0 | 56 | 10.3 |
| Soldier | 8 | 22.3 | 12 | 13.5 | 11 | 9.0 | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 20.0 | 1 | 4.3 | 5 | 8.7 | 6 | 35.3 | - | - | 1 | 100.0 | 6 | 21.4 | 17 | 34.8 | 4 | 16.0 | 73 | 13.4 |
| Seaman | 1 | 2.8 | 5 | 5.6 | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 5.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 4.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 14 | 2.6 |
| Artisan | 12 | 33.3 | 37 | 41.7 | 49 | 40.2 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 20.0 | 8 | 34.8 | 21 | 37.0 | 4 | 23.5 | 2 | 66.7 | - | - | 13 | 46.4 | 14 | 28.6 | 5 | 20.0 | 168 | 30.9 |
| Other | - | - | 3 | 3.4 | 4 | 3.3 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 4.3 | 2 | 3.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | 11 | 2.0 |
| Total | 36 | 100.0 | 89 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 108 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 49 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 543 | 100.0 |

Table 2.10. Conclusion of Service of Recruits, 1816-1830, by Means Other than Discharge.

| Year of | Strength | Reenlistments | | Desertions | | Deaths | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enlistment | N | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| 1816 | 743 | - | - | 2 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.5 |
| 1817 | 528 | - | - | 5 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 1818 | 396 | - | - | 17 | 4.3 | 0 | 0. |
| 1819 | 396 | - | - | 69 | 17.4 | 4 | 1.0 |
| 1820 | 645 | - | - | 70 | 10.8 | 70 | 10.8 |
| 1821 | 445 | 2 | 0.4 | 28 | 6.3 | 29 | 6.5 |
| 1822 | 421 | 1 | 0.2 | 6 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 1823 | 468 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 1.5 | 4 | 0.9 |
| 1824 | 432 | 2 | 0.6 | 4 | 0.9 | 8 | 1.9 |
| 1825 | 492 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 | 3.3 | 19 | 3.9 |
| 1826 | 515 | 0 | 0.0 | 31 | 6.0 | 24 | 4.7 |
| 1827 | 495 | 1 | 0.2 | 26 | 5.3 | 16 | 3.2 |
| 1828 | 423 | 14 | 3.3 | 15 | 3.5 | 14 | 3.3 |
| 1829 | 490 | 12 | 2.4 | 66 | 13.5 | 12 | 2.4 |
| 1830 | 450 | 17 | 3.8 | 72 | 16.0 | 18 | 4.0 |
| Totals | 7339 | 49 | 0.6 | 567 | 7.7 | 224 | 3.1 |

Table 2.11. Time in Service Prior to First Desertion, 1815-1830.

| Period Before First Desertion | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Less than One Year | 321 | 60.2 |
| Less than Two Years | 118 | 22.2 |
| Less Than Three Years | 60 | 11.3 |
| Less than Four Years | 19 | 3.8 |
| Less than Five Years | 13 | 2.5 |
| Totals | 554 | 100.0 |

Table 2.12. Age of Deserters from the Seventh Regiment, 1815-1830.

| Age at Desertion | N | (%) | Age at Desertion | N | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| less than 20 | 17 | 3.3 | 30 | 24 | 4.8 |
| 20 | 5 | 1.0 | 31 | 14 | 2.8 |
| 21 | 79 | 15.6 | 32 | 19 | 3.8 |
| 22 | 55 | 10.9 | 33 | 17 | 3.4 |
| 23 | 55 | 10.9 | 34 | 15 | 3.0 |
| 24 | 34 | 6.7 | 35 | 7 | 1.4 |
| 25 | 43 | 8.5 | 36 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 26 | 31 | 6.1 | 37 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 27 | 30 | 5.9 | 38 | 5 | 0.6 |
| 28 | 27 | 5.3 | 39 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 29 | 25 | 4.9 | over 40 | 2 | 0.4 |

Table 2.13. Record of Deserters, 1815-1830.

| Status | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Deserted, did not return | 377 | 68.1 |
| Deserted, apprehended and concluded term | 101 | 18.2 |
| Multiple desertions | 53 | 9.6 |
| Multiple Desertions, apprehended and concluded term | 23 | 4.1 |
| Totals | 554 | 100.0 |

Table 2.14. Age of Reenlistees in the Seventh Regiment, 1815-1830.

| Age at Reenlistment | N | (%) | Age at Reenlistment | N | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 and under | 3 | 6.9 | 32 | 3 | 6.9 |
| 26 | 7 | 14.4 | 33 | 3 | 6.9 |
| 27 | 5 | 11.6 | 34 | 1 | 2.3 |
| 28 | 5 | 11.6 | 35 | 1 | 2.3 |
| 29 | 5 | 11.6 | 36 | 1 | 2.3 |
| 30 | 2 | 4.7 | 37 | 2 | 4.7 |
| 31 | 1 | 2.3 | 38 | 1 | 2.3 |
| | | | 39 and over | 3 | 6.9 |

Table 2.15. Former Occupation of Reenlistees, 1815-1830.

| Occupation | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Laborer | 10 | 23.2 |
| Farmer | 9 | 21.1 |
| Soldier | 11 | 25.5 |
| Seaman | 1 | 2.3 |
| Artisan | 11 | 25.5 |
| Miscellaneous | 1 | 2.3 |
| Totals | 43 | 100.0 |

Table 3.1. Strength: U.S. Army and Seventh Infantry Regiment, 1831-44.

| Strength | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. Army | | 7th Regiment | | |
| year | authorized | actual | authorized | actual | % of Army |
| 1831 | 6,126 | 5,869 | 547 | 454 | 8.1 |
| 1832 | 7,129 | 6,102 | " | 549 | 10.1 |
| 1833 | 7,194 | 6,412 | " | 480 | 8.4 |
| 1834 | " | 6,824 | " | 454 | 7.4 |
| 1835 | " | 7,151 | " | 526 | 8.1 |
| 1836 | 7,957 | 6,283 | " | 442 | 7.9 |
| 1837 | " | 7,834 | " | 544 | 7.7 |
| 1838 | 12,539 | 8,653 | 937 | 520 | 6.5 |
| 1839 | " | 9,704 | " | 481 | 8.0 |
| 1840 | " | 10,570 | " | 619 | 6.3 |
| 1841 | " | 11,169 | " | 762 | 7.3 |
| 1842 | 12,529/8,613 | 10,628 | 937/557 | 673 | 6.8 |
| 1843 | 8,613 | 8,935 | 557 | 530 | 6.5 |
| 1844 | " | 8,573 | " | 488 | 5.7 |

Source: Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1831-1843; Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903), 2: 626; Registers of Enlistments, Seventh Regiment, U.S. Infantry, National Archives, RG 94, Microcopy 233, rolls 19-21.

Table 3.2. Comparison of National and Regimental Recruiting Efforts, 1831-1844.

| | Recruits | |
|---|---|---|
| year | U.S. Army | 7th Regiment |
| 1831 | 1,511 | 115 |
| 1832 | 1,462 | 139 |
| 1833 | 2,036 | 77 |
| 1834 | 2,111 | 255 |
| 1835 | 1,590 | 71 |
| 1836 | 1,650 | 81 |
| 1837 | 421 | 350 |
| 1838 | 4,247 | 132 |
| 1839 | 440 | 186 |
| 1840 | 6,316 | 456 |
| 1841 | 4,922 | 194 |
| 1842 | 2,391 | 45 |
| 1843 | 177 | 19 |
| 1844 | 1,999 | 174 |

Source: Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1831-1844; Registers of Enlistments, Seventh Regiment, U.S. Infantry, National Archives, Washington, DC, Record Group 94, microcopy 233, rolls 19-21.

Table 3.3. Age at Enlistment in the Seventh Regiment, 1831-1844

| Year | Age (N) | Native (N) | Immigrant (N) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1831 | 25.57 (113 of 114) | 25.99 (82) | 24.45 (31) |
| 1832 | 25.83 (139 of 139) | 25.88 (97) | 25.71 (42) |
| 1833 | 27.56 (77 of 77) | 27.52 (46) | 27.61 (31) |
| 1834 | 25.60 (255 of 255) | 25.87 (130) | 25.33 (125) |
| 1835 | 26.32 (71 of 71) | 26.36 (36) | 26.29 (35) |
| 1836 | 27.75 (81 of 81) | 27.93 (59) | 27.27 (22) |
| 1837 | 26.97 (349 of 350) | 28.21 (185) | 25.62 (164) |
| 1838 | 26.33 (132 of 132) | 26.88 (57) | 25.91 (75) |
| 1839 | 25.94 (184 of 186) | 25.97 (88) | 25.89 (96) |
| 1840 | 26.60 (456 of 456) | 26.94 (199) | 26.34 (257) |
| 1841 | 25.43 (194 of 194) | 25.24 (82) | 25.56 (112) |
| 1842 | 24.89 (45 of 45) | 23.71 (28) | 26.83 (17) |
| 1843 | 25.06 (18 of 19) | 25.15 (13) | 24.80 (5) |
| 1844 | 26.34 (174 of 174) | 26.25 (96) | 26.46 (78) |
| N | 2289 of 2293 | 1198 | 1091 |

Note: The data in tables 3.3-3.15 are compiled from Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, National Archives, Washington, DC, Record Group 94, Microcopy 233, rolls 19-21.

Table 3.4. Birthplaces of all Recruits, 1831-1844.

| Year | Native-Born | | Foreign Born | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| 1831 | 83 | 72.81 | 31 | 27.91 |
| 1832 | 97 | 69.78 | 42 | 30.22 |
| 1833 | 46 | 59.74 | 31 | 40.26 |
| 1834 | 130 | 50.98 | 125 | 49.02 |
| 1835 | 36 | 50.70 | 35 | 49.30 |
| 1836 | 59 | 72.84 | 22 | 27.16 |
| 1837 | 187 | 53.28 | 164 | 46.72 |
| 1838 | 57 | 43.18 | 75 | 56.82 |
| 1839 | 88 | 47.31 | 98 | 52.69 |
| 1840 | 199 | 43.64 | 257 | 56.36 |
| 1841 | 82 | 42.49 | 111 | 57.51 |
| 1842 | 28 | 62.22 | 17 | 37.78 |
| 1843 | 14 | 73.68 | 5 | 26.32 |
| 1844 | 100 | 57.47 | 74 | 26.32 |

Table 3.5. Birthplaces of Native-Born Recruits, 1831-1844.

| State | 1831 | | 1832 | | 1833 | | 1834 | | 1835 | | 1836 | | 1837 | | 1838 | | 1839 | | 1840 | | 1841 | | 1842 | | 1843 | | 1844 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | % |
| Maine | 2 | 2.4 | 6 | 6.2 | 1 | 2.2 | 4 | 3.3 | 1 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.8 | 4 | 2.2 | - | - | 1 | 1.1 | 7 | 3.5 | 1 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 29 | 2.5 |
| New Hampshire | 4 | 4.8 | 5 | 5.2 | 1 | 2.2 | 3 | 2.5 | 1 | 2.8 | - | - | 5 | 2.7 | 1 | 1.8 | 2 | 2.2 | 13 | 6.5 | 3 | 3.8 | - | - | 2 | 18.2 | 1 | 1.0 | 41 | 3.5 |
| Vermont | 5 | 6.0 | 2 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.5 | 7 | 5.8 | 2 | 5.6 | 2 | 3.5 | 5 | 2.7 | - | - | 8 | 9.0 | 10 | 5.0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.74 | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 48 | 4.1 |
| Massachusetts | 15 | 18.2 | 9 | 9.3 | 1 | 2.2 | 13 | 10.7 | 1 | 2.8 | 3 | 5.3 | 6 | 3.3 | 5 | 8.9 | 5 | 5.8 | 14 | 7.0 | 7 | 8.4 | 2 | 7.4 | - | - | 6 | 6.3 | 87 | 7.4 |
| Rhode Island | 3 | 3.6 | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | 1 | 1.1 | 3 | 1.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 9.1 | 1 | 1.0 | 14 | 1.1 |
| Connecticut | 11 | 13.3 | 11 | 11.3 | 2 | 4.3 | 6 | 4.8 | 2 | 5.6 | - | - | 9 | 4.9 | 2 | 3.5 | 5 | 5.8 | 6 | 3.0 | 6 | 7.3 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2.1 | 62 | 5.2 |
| Totals | 40 | 48.3 | 34 | 35.1 | 8 | 17.4 | 34 | 27.9 | 8 | 22.4 | 7 | 12.4 | 30 | 16.3 | 8 | 14.2 | 22 | 25.0 | 53 | 26.5 | 18 | 21.9 | 4 | 14.8 | 3 | 27.3 | 12 | 12.4 | 281 | 23.8 |
| New York | 19 | 22.9 | 34 | 35.1 | 18 | 39.1 | 44 | 36.7 | 7 | 18.8 | 16 | 27.8 | 71 | 39.1 | 23 | 39.8 | 32 | 36.8 | 69 | 34.9 | 32 | 39.4 | - | - | 1 | 9.1 | 31 | 32.8 | 397 | 34.1 |
| New Jersey | 4 | 4.8 | 1 | 1.0 | 4 | 8.7 | 7 | 5.8 | 1 | 2.8 | 3 | 5.3 | 7 | 3.8 | 6 | 10.5 | 3 | 3.3 | 8 | 4.0 | 7 | 8.4 | 10 | 37.1 | - | - | 5 | 5.2 | 66 | 5.6 |
| Pennsylvania | 7 | 8.4 | 19 | 19.5 | 5 | 10.8 | 16 | 13.2 | 8 | 22.4 | 10 | 17.4 | 39 | 21.3 | 8 | 14.2 | 12 | 13.6 | 35 | 17.6 | 14 | 17.1 | 7 | 25.9 | 2 | 18.2 | 19 | 19.8 | 201 | 17.0 |
| Totals | 30 | 36.1 | 54 | 55.6 | 27 | 58.6 | 67 | 55.7 | 16 | 44.0 | 29 | 50.5 | 117 | 64.2 | 37 | 64.5 | 47 | 53.7 | 112 | 56.5 | 53 | 64.9 | 17 | 63.0 | 3 | 27.3 | 55 | 57.8 | 664 | 56.7 |
| Delaware | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 2.2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 9.1 | - | - | 6 | 0.5 |
| Maryland* | 3 | 3.6 | 3 | 3.1 | 1 | 2.2 | - | - | 3 | 8.3 | 3 | 5.3 | 13 | 7.2 | 2 | 3.5 | 6 | 6.8 | 13 | 6.5 | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | 9 | 9.2 | 58 | 4.9 |
| Virginia | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.5 | 5 | 4.1 | 3 | 8.4 | 3 | 5.3 | 6 | 3.3 | 2 | 3.5 | 7 | 7.9 | 3 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | 1 | 9.1 | 4 | 4.2 | 42 | 3.6 |
| North Carolina | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.2 | 3 | 2.5 | 2 | 5.6 | 3 | 5.3 | 3 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.8 | 2 | 2.2 | 3 | 1.5 | 1 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | 1.6 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | 4 | 8.7 | 3 | 2.5 | - | - | 4 | 7.0 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.8 | - | - | 3 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 21 | 1.7 |
| Georgia | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2.5 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.1 | - | - | 1 | 1.1 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | 1 | 3.7 | - | - | 2 | 2.1 | 12 | 1.0 |
| Florida | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 9.1 | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| Alabama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Mississippi | 1 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 3 | 0.2 |
| Louisiana | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.0 | - | - | 1 | 3.7 | - | - | 2 | 2.1 | 8 | 0.6 |
| Totals | 9 | 10.8 | 6 | 6.2 | 10 | 21.8 | 14 | 11.6 | 9 | 25.2 | 15 | 26.5 | 28 | 15.2 | 7 | 15.2 | 16 | 18.0 | 26 | 13.0 | 7 | 8.4 | 2 | 7.4 | 3 | 27.3 | 20 | 20.6 | 172 | 14.3 |
| Michigan | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 3.7 | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 4 | 0.3 |
| Ohio | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | 2 | 1.6 | 1 | 2.8 | 3 | 5.3 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | 1 | 1.1 | 5 | 2.5 | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5.2 | 24 | 2.0 |
| Missouri | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 5 | 0.4 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 5.6 | 2 | 3.5 | 3 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.8 | - | - | 2 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 0.9 |
| Tennessee | 2 | 2.4 | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 2.2 | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | 1 | 1.8 | 4 | 2.2 | 3 | 5.3 | 2 | 2.2 | - | - | 1 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 18 | 1.5 |
| Totals | 4 | 4.8 | 3 | 3.1 | 1 | 2.2 | 6 | 4.8 | 3 | 8.4 | 6 | 10.6 | 8 | 4.3 | 4 | 7.1 | 3 | 3.3 | 8 | 4.0 | 4 | 4.8 | 4 | 14.8 | 2 | 18.2 | 8 | 8.2 | 64 | 5.1 |
| Cantonment Towson, Choctaw Nation | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Grand Totals | 83 | 100.0 | 97 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 | 121 | 100.0 | 36 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 183 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 88 | 100.0 | 199 | 100.0 | 82 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 | 96 | 100.0 | 1183 | 100.0 |

*includes Washington DC

Table 3.6. Birthplaces of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1831-44.

| Country | 1831 | | 1832 | | 1833 | | 1834 | | 1835 | | 1836 | | 1837 | | 1838 | | 1839 | | 1840 | | 1841 | | 1842 | | 1843 | | 1844 | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | % |
| England | 3 | 9.7 | 8 | 19.0 | 4 | 12.9 | 16 | 12.8 | 6 | 17.1 | 3 | 13.6 | 31 | 18.9 | 11 | 14.7 | 11 | 11.2 | 30 | 11.7 | 12 | 10.8 | 1 | 5.9 | - | - | 5 | 6.4 | 140 | 12.8 |
| Scotland | 2 | 6.5 | 7 | 16.7 | 3 | 9.7 | 8 | 6.4 | 3 | 8.6 | 1 | 4.5 | 13 | 7.9 | 3 | 4.0 | - | - | 18 | 7.0 | 5 | 4.5 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2.6 | 65 | 6.0 |
| Wales | - | - | 1 | 2.4 | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 4.1 | 2 | 0.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 0.7 |
| Ireland | 21 | 67.7 | 18 | 42.8 | 21 | 67.8 | 81 | 64.8 | 20 | 57.1 | 6 | 27.2 | 97 | 59.2 | 52 | 69.4 | 58 | 59.4 | 160 | 62.8 | 60 | 54.1 | 10 | 58.8 | 1 | 20.0 | 40 | 51.3 | 645 | 59.1 |
| Holland | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.1 |
| Belgium | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| France | - | - | 1 | 2.4 | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | 1 | 2.9 | 1 | 4.5 | - | - | 1 | 1.3 | 3 | 3.0 | 2 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.9 | - | - | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 3.8 | 16 | 1.5 |
| Germany | 2 | 6.5 | 3 | 7.1 | - | - | 16 | 12.8 | 4 | 11.4 | 7 | 32.1 | 20 | 12.2 | 6 | 8.0 | 14 | 14.3 | 34 | 13.2 | 25 | 22.5 | 6 | 35.3 | 2 | 40.0 | 24 | 30.8 | 163 | 14.9 |
| Hungary | - | - | 1 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| Austria | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 4.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| Switzerland | - | - | 1 | 2.4 | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.5 |
| Denmark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| Poland | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | - | - | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 1.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 0.5 |
| Spain | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| Sweden | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >0.1 |
| Canada | - | - | 2 | 4.8 | 1 | 3.2 | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | 3 | 13.6 | 1 | 0.6 | 2 | 2.6 | 6 | 6.1 | 6 | 2.3 | 4 | 3.6 | - | - | - | - | 4 | 5.1 | 31 | 2.8 |
| South America | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.1 |
| Totals | 31 | 100.0 | 42 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 | 125 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 | 164 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 | 98 | 100.0 | 257 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 78 | 100.0 | 1091 | 100.0 |

Table 3.7. Occupations of All Recruits, 1831-1844.

| Occupation | 1831 | | 1832 | | 1833 | | 1834 | | 1835 | | 1836 | | 1837 | | 1838 | | 1839 | | 1840 | | 1841 | | 1842 | | 1843 | | 1844 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 27 | 23.5 | 47 | 33.8 | 19 | 24.8 | 91 | 36.6 | 17 | 24.3 | 15 | 18.9 | 81 | 23.8 | 42 | 32.3 | 62 | 33.7 | 140 | 30.7 | 56 | 29.0 | 13 | 28.9 | 8 | 44.4 | 54 | 31.0 | 672 | 29.6 |
| Farmer | 19 | 16.5 | 29 | 20.9 | 9 | 11.7 | 28 | 11.2 | 6 | 8.6 | 1 | 1.3 | 13 | 3.8 | 8 | 6.2 | 15 | 8.2 | 35 | 7.7 | 21 | 10.9 | 4 | 8.9 | - | - | 10 | 5.7 | 198 | 8.7 |
| Soldier | 19 | 16.5 | 16 | 11.5 | 35 | 45.3 | 54 | 21.7 | 28 | 40.0 | 49 | 62.1 | 110 | 32.4 | 29 | 22.3 | 41 | 22.2 | 148 | 32.6 | 68 | 35.2 | 9 | 20.0 | 7 | 38.9 | 71 | 41.6 | 684 | 30.0 |
| Seaman | 3 | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 1.5 | 4 | 3.1 | 6 | 3.3 | 10 | 2.1 | 4 | 2.1 | 1 | 2.2 | 1 | 5.6 | 3 | 1.0 | 39 | 1.7 |
| Artisan | 46 | 40.0 | 46 | 33.1 | 14 | 18.2 | 69 | 27.7 | 192 | 7.1 | 14 | 17.7 | 131 | 38.5 | 46 | 35.3 | 59 | 32.1 | 120 | 26.3 | 42 | 21.8 | 18 | 40.0 | 2 | 11.1 | 36 | 20.7 | 662 | 29.2 |
| Other | - | - | 1 | 0.7 | - | - | 5 | 2.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.6 | 2 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 0.5 |
| Total | 115 | 100.0 | 139 | 100.0 | 77 | 100.0 | 249 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 340 | 100.0 | 130 | 100.0 | 184 | 100.0 | 456 | 100.0 | 193 | 100.0 | 45 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 174 | 100.0 | 2268 | 100.0 |

Table 3.8. Occupations of Native-Born Recruits, 1831-1844.

| Occupation | 1831 | | 1832 | | 1833 | | 1834 | | 1835 | | 1836 | | 1837 | | 1838 | | 1839 | | 1840 | | 1841 | | 1842 | | 1843 | | 1844 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 15 | 18.1 | 30 | 31.1 | 6 | 13.0 | 26 | 20.9 | 7 | 19.4 | 10 | 17.5 | 30 | 16.2 | 10 | 17.5 | 17 | 19.5 | 31 | 15.6 | 17 | 20.9 | 8 | 28.6 | 6 | 46.1 | 24 | 25.0 | 237 | 19.9 |
| Farmer | 18 | 21.7 | 29 | 29.8 | 8 | 17.4 | 21 | 16.9 | 4 | 11.2 | 1 | 1.8 | 9 | 4.9 | 5 | 8.9 | 11 | 12.6 | 24 | 12.1 | 13 | 16.0 | 3 | 10.7 | - | - | 7 | 7.3 | 153 | 12.7 |
| Soldier | 15 | 18.1 | 13 | 13.4 | 25 | 54.4 | 38 | 30.8 | 18 | 50.0 | 38 | 66.7 | 72 | 38.9 | 21 | 36.8 | 26 | 29.9 | 84 | 42.2 | 32 | 39.7 | 6 | 21.4 | 5 | 38.5 | 47 | 49.0 | 401 | 36.2 |
| Seaman | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3.5 | 6 | 6.9 | 9 | 4.5 | 2 | 2.5 | - | - | 1 | 7.7 | 3 | 3.1 | 27 | 2.3 |
| Artisan | 33 | 39.7 | 25 | 25.7 | 7 | 15.2 | 35 | 28.2 | 7 | 19.4 | 8 | 14.0 | 72 | 38.9 | 19 | 33.3 | 27 | 31.1 | 50 | 25.1 | 17 | 20.9 | 11 | 39.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 15 | 15.6 | 327 | 27.5 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.4 |
| Totals | 83 | 100.0 | 97 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 | 124 | 100.0 | 36 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 185 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 87 | 100.0 | 199 | 100.0 | 81 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 13 | 100.0 | 96 | 100.0 | 1189 | 100.0 |

Table 3.9. Occupations of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1831-1844.

| Occupation | 1831 | | 1832 | | 1833 | | 1834 | | 1835 | | 1836 | | 1837 | | 1838 | | 1839 | | 1840 | | 1841 | | 1842 | | 1843 | | 1844 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 12 | 37.5 | 17 | 40.5 | 13 | 41.9 | 65 | 52.0 | 10 | 29.4 | 5 | 22.7 | 51 | 32.5 | 32 | 44.0 | 45 | 46.9 | 109 | 42.4 | 39 | 34.9 | 5 | 29.4 | 2 | 40.0 | 30 | 38.0 | 435 | 40.2 |
| Farmer | 1 | 3.1 | - | - | 1 | 3.2 | 7 | 5.6 | 2 | 5.9 | - | - | 4 | 2.5 | 3 | 4.1 | 4 | 4.2 | 11 | 4.3 | 8 | 7.1 | 1 | 5.9 | - | - | 3 | 3.8 | 45 | 4.2 |
| Soldier | 4 | 12.5 | 3 | 7.1 | 10 | 32.3 | 16 | 12.8 | 10 | 29.4 | 11 | 50.0 | 38 | 24.2 | 8 | 10.9 | 15 | 15.6 | 64 | 24.9 | 36 | 32.1 | 3 | 17.6 | 2 | 40.0 | 24 | 30.8 | 244 | 22.6 |
| Seaman | 1 | 3.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 3.2 | 2 | 2.7 | - | - | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 1.8 | 1 | 5.9 | - | - | - | - | 12 | 1.1 |
| Artisan | 13 | 40.6 | 21 | 50.0 | 7 | 22.6 | 34 | 27.2 | 12 | 35.3 | 6 | 27.2 | 59 | 37.6 | 27 | 36.9 | 32 | 33.3 | 70 | 27.2 | 25 | 22.3 | 7 | 41.2 | 1 | 20.0 | 21 | 6.9 | 335 | 31.1 |
| Other | - | - | 1 | 2.4 | - | - | 3 | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.3 | - | - | 2 | 0.7 | 2 | 1.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 0.8 |
| Totals | 32 | 100.0 | 42 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 | 125 | 100.0 | 34 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 | 157 | 100.0 | 73 | 100.0 | 96 | 100.0 | 257 | 100.0 | 112 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 78 | 100.0 | 1080 | 100.0 |

Table 3.10. Conclusion of Service of Recruits, 1831-1844, by Means Other than Discharge.

| Year | Strength | Reenlistments | | Desertions | | Deaths | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| 1831 | 454 | 5 | 1.1 | 62 | 13.7 | 14 | 3.1 |
| 1832 | 549 | 3 | 0.5 | 25 | 4.6 | 7 | 1.3 |
| 1833 | 480 | 15 | 3.1 | 15 | 3.1 | 34 | 7.1 |
| 1834 | 454 | 48 | 10.6 | 22 | 4.8 | 68 | 14.9 |
| 1835 | 526 | 15 | 2.9 | 15 | 2.9 | 34 | 6.5 |
| 1836 | 442 | 31 | 7.0 | 22 | 5.0 | 18 | 4.1 |
| 1837 | 544 | 53 | 9.7 | 38 | 7.0 | 38 | 7.0 |
| 1838 | 520 | 8 | 1.5 | 28 | 5.4 | 19 | 3.7 |
| 1839 | 481 | 15 | 3.1 | 17 | 3.5 | 28 | 5.8 |
| 1840 | 619 | 60 | 9.7 | 22 | 3.6 | 71 | 11.5 |
| 1841 | 762 | 21 | 2.8 | 17 | 2.2 | 56 | 7.3 |
| 1842 | 673 | - | - | 26 | 3.9 | 52 | 7.7 |
| 1843 | 530 | 1 | 0.1 | 64 | 12.1 | 56 | 10.6 |
| 1844 | 510 | 10 | 1.9 | 37 | 7.3 | 19 | 3.7 |
| Totals | 7544 | 262 | 3.5 | 410 | 5.4 | 514 | 6.8 |

Table 3.11. Time in Service Prior to First Desertion, 1831-44.

| Period Before First Desertion | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Less than One Year | 379 | 70.3 |
| Less than Two Years | 76 | 14.1 |
| Less Than Three Years | 62 | 11.5 |
| Less than Four Years | 15 | 2.8 |
| Less than Five Years | 7 | 1.3 |
| Totals | 539 | 100.0 |

Table 3.12. Age of Deserters from the Seventh Regiment, 1831-1844.

| Age at Desertion | N | (%) | Age at Desertion | N | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| less than 20 | 27 | 6.6 | 28 | 17 | 4.1 |
| 20 | 4 | 0.9 | 29 | 15 | 3.6 |
| 21 | 57 | 14.1 | 30 | 16 | 3.9 |
| 22 | 55 | 13.4 | 31 | 15 | 3.6 |
| 23 | 38 | 9.2 | 32 | 13 | 3.2 |
| 24 | 35 | 8.5 | 33 | 7 | 1.7 |
| 25 | 30 | 7.3 | 34 | 7 | 1.7 |
| 26 | 28 | 6.8 | 35 | 6 | 1.5 |
| 27 | 39 | 9.5 | 36 and over | 2 | 0.4 |

Table 3.13. Record of Deserters, 1831-1844.

| Status | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Deserted, did not return | 232 | 56.9 |
| Deserted, apprehended and concluded term | 87 | 21.3 |
| Deserted, apprehended and punished | 33 | 8.1 |
| Multiple desertions | 43 | 10.5 |
| Multiple Desertions, apprehended and concluded term | 13 | 3.2 |
| Totals | 408 | 100.0 |

Table 3.14. Age of Reenlistees in the Seventh Regiment, 1831-1844.

| Age at Reenlistment | N | (%) | Age at Reenlistment | N | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| under 21 | 3 | 1.1 | 30 | 18 | 6.3 |
| 21 | 2 | 0.7 | 31 | 13 | 6.7 |
| 22 | 5 | 1.8 | 32 | 11 | 3.9 |
| 23 | 5 | 1.8 | 33 | 20 | 7.4 |
| 24 | 35 | 13.7 | 34 | 13 | 4.6 |
| 25 | 23 | 8.1 | 35 | 14 | 4.9 |
| 26 | 15 | 5.3 | 36 | 16 | 5.6 |
| 27 | 13 | 4.6 | 37 | 6 | 2.1 |
| 28 | 17 | 5.9 | 38 | 16 | 5.6 |
| 29 | 23 | 8.1 | 39 and over | 5 | 1.8 |

Table 3.15. Former Occupation of Reenlistees, 1831-1844.

| Occupation | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Laborer | 52 | 18.6 |
| Farmer | 29 | 10.4 |
| Soldier | 116 | 41.3 |
| Seaman | 5 | 1.8 |
| Artisan | 77 | 27.6 |
| Miscellaneous | 1 | 0.3 |
| Totals | 279 | 100.0 |

Table 4.1. Strength: U.S. Army and Seventh Infantry Regiment, 1845-48.

| Strength | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. Army | | 7th Regiment | | |
| year | authorized | actual | authorized | actual | % of Army |
| 1845 | 8,613 | 7,523 | 557 | 441 | 5.7 |
| 1846 | 12,216 | 9,811 | 777 | 491 | 5.0 |
| 1847 | 30,866 | 20,333 | 1,138 | 787* | 3.9 |
| 1848 | 10,317 | 9,106 | 558 | 488 | 5.4 |

*During the Mexican War, no comprehensive figures were available for the 1847 Annual Report. The strength for the Seventh Regiment was taken from the November, 1847 Regimental Return, RG 94, Microcopy 665, roll 79. Other sources for this table include: Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1845-48; Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903); and Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, RG 94, Microcopy 233, rolls 20-23.

Table 4.2. Comparison of National and Regimental Recruiting Efforts, 1845-48.

| | Recruits | |
|---|---|---|
| year | U.S. Army | 7th Regiment |
| 1845 | 3,557 | 197 |
| 1846 | 5,945 | 317 |
| 1847 | 10,118 | 85 |
| 1848 | 10,723 | 274 |
| 1847-48* | 10,562 | 534 |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February, 1847.

Source: Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1845-48; Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, RG 94, Microcopy 233, rolls 21-23.

Table 4.3. Age at Enlistment in the Seventh Regiment, 1845-1848.

| Year | Mean Age (#) | Native (#) | Immigrant (#) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1845 | 27.80 (197 of 197) | 28.65 (77) | 27.26 (120 |
| 1846 | 24.77 (316 of 317) | 24.53 (123) | 24.92(193) |
| 1847 | 25.30 (84 of 85) | 23.83 (23) | 25.85 (61) |
| 1848 | 23.98 (273 of 274) | 23.88 (104) | 24.04(169) |
| 1847-48* | 25.37 (534 of 534) | 24.95 (325) | 26.01 (209) |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February, 1847.

Note: The data in tables 4.3-4.15 are compiled from Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, National Archives, Record Group 94, Microcopy 233, rolls 21-23.

Table 4.4. Birthplaces of All Recruits, 1845-1848.

| Year | Native-Born | | Foreign Born | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| 1845 | 80 | 40.61 | 117 | 59.39 |
| 1846 | 132 | 41.64 | 184 | 58.04 |
| 1847 | 27 | 31.76 | 57 | 67.06 |
| 1848 | 111 | 40.61 | 162 | 59.12 |
| 1847-48* | 328 | 61.42 | 202 | 37.83 |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February 1847.

Table 4.5. Birthplaces of Native-Born Recruits, 1845-1848.

| State | 1845 N(%) | | 1846 N(%) | | 1847 N(%) | | 1848 N(%) | | 1847-48** N(%) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maine | 1 | 1.3 | 30 | 24.7 | - | - | 11 | 10.7 | 8 | 2.5 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 2.6 | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | 3 | 2.9 | 5 | 1.6 |
| Vermont | 1 | 1.3 | 7 | 5.8 | 3 | 15.0 | 4 | 3.9 | 8 | 2.5 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 2.6 | 16 | 13.3 | - | - | 5 | 4.8 | 17 | 5.3 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | 2 | 1.9 | 2 | 0.6 |
| Connecticut | 2 | 2.6 | 3 | 2.4 | - | - | 5 | 4.8 | 4 | 1.2 |
| Totals | 8 | 10.4 | 59 | 48.6 | 3 | 15.0 | 30 | 28.9 | 44 | 13.7 |
| New York | 32 | 41.5 | 48 | 39.3 | 7 | 35.0 | 27 | 26.4 | 70 | 21.9 |
| New Jersey | - | - | 2 | 1.6 | - | - | 4 | 3.9 | 13 | 4.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 15 | 19.5 | 7 | 5.7 | 4 | 20.0 | 16 | 15.6 | 80 | 25.0 |
| Totals | 47 | 61.0 | 57 | 46.6 | 11 | 55.0 | 47 | 45.9 | 163 | 51.1 |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.3 |
| Maryland* | 4 | 5.2 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2.9 | 30 | 9.4 |
| Virginia | 4 | 5.2 | 2 | 1.6 | 1 | 5.0 | 7 | 6.9 | 5 | 1.6 |
| North Carolina | 2 | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0.9 |
| South Carolina | 1 | 1.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Georgia | - | - | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.3 |
| Florida | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Alabama | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.9 | - | - |
| Mississippi | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Louisiana | 1 | 1.3 | - | - | 1 | 5.0 | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | 12 | 15.6 | 3 | 2.4 | 2 | 10.0 | 11 | 10.7 | 41 | 12.8 |
| Michigan | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.3 |
| Ohio | 4 | 5.2 | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | 7 | 6.9 | 41 | 12.8 |
| Indiana | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 3.1 |
| Illinois | 1 | 1.3 | 3 | 2.4 | 2 | 10.0 | 15 | 14.5 | 72 | 22.4 |
| Missouri | 2 | 2.6 | - | - | 1 | 5.0 | 1 | 0.9 | - | - |
| Kentucky | 3 | 3.9 | 2 | 1.6 | 1 | 5.0 | 3 | 2.9 | 18 | 5.6 |
| Tennessee | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2.9 | 2 | 0.6 |
| Totals | 10 | 13.0 | 3 | 2.4 | 4 | 20.0 | 15 | 14.5 | 72 | 22.4 |
| Grand Totals | 77 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 103 | 100.0 | 320 | 100.0 |

*includes Washington, DC.

**Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February, 1847.

Table 4.6. Birthplaces of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1845-48.

| Country | 1845 | | 1846 | | 1847 | | 1848 | | 1847-48* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| England | 10 | 8.3 | 25 | 12.9 | 3 | 4.9 | 18 | 10.6 | 23 | 11.0 |
| Scotland | 6 | 5.0 | 14 | 7.3 | 1 | 1.6 | 4 | 2.4 | 8 | 3.8 |
| Wales | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Ireland | 65 | 54.2 | 106 | 54.9 | 27 | 44.3 | 105 | 62.1 | 72 | 34.4 |
| Holland | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | - | - |
| Switzerland | 3 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Germany | 26 | 21.7 | 31 | 16.1 | 23 | 37.7 | 26 | 15.4 | 88 | 42.2 |
| Poland | 2 | 1.7 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.2 | - | - |
| France | 2 | 1.7 | 5 | 2.6 | 3 | 4.9 | 4 | 2.4 | 10 | 4.8 |
| Italy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | - | - |
| Norway | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sweden | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Canada | 3 | 2.5 | 9 | 4.7 | 4 | 6.6 | 7 | 4.1 | 7 | 3.3 |
| Totals | 120 | 100.0 | 193 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 169 | 100.0 | 209 | 100.0 |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February, 1847.

Table 4.7. Occupations of All Recruits, 1845-1848.

| Occupation | 1845 | | 1846 | | 1847 | | 1848 | | 1847-48* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 43 | 22.1 | 126 | 41.1 | 27 | 32.1 | 99 | 36.7 | 159 | 30.0 |
| Farmer | 16 | 8.2 | 52 | 16.9 | 15 | 17.9 | 34 | 12.6 | 103 | 19.4 |
| Soldier | 111 | 57.0 | 42 | 13.7 | 13 | 15.5 | 25 | 9.3 | 26 | 4.9 |
| Seaman | 3 | 1.5 | 7 | 2.3 | - | - | 23 | 8.5 | 21 | 3.9 |
| Artisan | 21 | 10.7 | 78 | 25.4 | 27 | 32.1 | 89 | 32.9 | 216 | 40.9 |
| Miscellaneous | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.6 | 2 | 2.4 | - | - | 5 | 0.9 |
| Totals | 195 | 100.0 | 307 | 100.0 | 84 | 100.0 | 270 | 100.0 | 530 | 100.0 |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February 1847.

Table 4.8. Occupations of Native-Born Recruits, 1845-1848.

| Occupation | 1845 | | 1846 | | 1847 | | 1848 | | 1847-48* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 11 | 14.4 | 40 | 34.3 | 7 | 30.4 | 27 | 26.2 | 82 | 24.1 |
| Farmer | 7 | 9.2 | 30 | 25.6 | 6 | 26.1 | 14 | 13.6 | 74 | 21.7 |
| Soldier | 46 | 60.7 | 19 | 16.2 | 6 | 26.1 | 14 | 13.6 | 18 | 5.3 |
| Seaman | 3 | 3.9 | 2 | 1.7 | - | - | 16 | 15.5 | 15 | 4.4 |
| Artisan | 8 | 10.3 | 25 | 21.4 | 4 | 17.4 | 32 | 31.1 | 150 | 43.9 |
| Miscellaneous | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.6 |
| Totals | 76 | 100.0 | 117 | 100.0 | 23 | 100.0 | 103 | 100.0 | 341 | 100.0 |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February, 1847.

Table 4.9. Occupations of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1845-1848.

| | 1845 | | 1846 | | 1847 | | 1848 | | 1847-48* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Occupation | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 32 | 26.9 | 86 | 45.3 | 20 | 32.8 | 72 | 43.2 | 77 | 36.8 |
| Farmer | 9 | 7.5 | 22 | 11.6 | 9 | 14.8 | 20 | 11.9 | 29 | 13.9 |
| Soldier | 65 | 54.7 | 23 | 12.1 | 7 | 11.5 | 11 | 6.6 | 8 | 3.8 |
| Seaman | - | - | 5 | 2.6 | - | - | 7 | 4.2 | 6 | 2.9 |
| Artisan | 13 | 10.9 | 53 | 27.9 | 23 | 37.6 | 57 | 34.1 | 86 | 41.2 |
| Miscellaneous | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | 3.3 | - | - | 3 | 1.4 |
| Totals | 119 | 100.0 | 190 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 167 | 100.0 | 209 | 100.0 |

*Enlistments authorized under Acts of 11 January and 11 February, 1847.

Table 4.10. Conclusion of Service, 1845-1848, by Means Other than Discharge.

| Year | Strength | Reenlistments | | Desertions | | Deaths | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| 1845 | 441 | 28 | 6.3 | 39 | 8.8 | 7 | 1.6 |
| 1846 | 491 | 6 | 1.2 | 47 | 9.8 | 16 | 3.3 |
| 1847 | 787 | 3 | 0.3 | 41 | 5.2 | 185 | 23.5 |
| 1848 | 488 | 1 | 0.2 | 142 | 29.9 | 56 | 11.5 |
| Totals | 2207 | 38 | 1.7 | 269 | 12.2 | 264 | 11.9 |

Table 4.11. Desertions During the Mexican War, 1845-48.

| Date | | 5-year recruits | | Duration recruits | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | N | % | N | % |
| 1845 and 1846 (From postings on Gulf Coast through campaigns in Northern Mexico) | 86 | 86 | 31.9 | - | - |
| January through September, 1847 (Troops placed under General Scott and assault at Vera Cruz through campaigns in Central Mexico) | 31 | 23 | 8.5 | 8 | 2.9 |
| October 1847 through June 1848 (Occupation of Mexico City) | 47 | 31 | 11.5 | 16 | 5.9 |
| July through December 1848 (Return to United States) | 105 | 104 | 38.7 | 1 | 0.3 |
| Totals | 269 | 244 | 90.7 | 25 | 9.2 |

Table 4.12. Desertions by Nativity, 1845-1848.

| Year | Desertions | Native-Born | | Foreign-Born | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | N | % | N | % |
| 1845 | 39 | 17 | 43.6 | 22 | 56.4 |
| 1846 | 47 | 12 | 25.5 | 35 | 74.5 |
| 1847 | 26 | 6 | 23.1 | 20 | 76.9 |
| 1848 | 137 | 68 | 49.6 | 69 | 50.4 |
| Totals | 249 | 103 | 41.4 | 146 | 58.6 |

Table 4.13. Desertions Among 5-year Recruits Considered by Birthplace, 1845-1848.

| Birthplace | E* | Desertions | % (Desertions) | % (Ethnicity)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| United States | 508 | 97 | 38.9 | 19.1 |
| Ireland | 382 | 76 | 30.5 | 19.8 |
| Germany | 143 | 27 | 10.8 | 18.9 |
| England | 69 | 23 | 9.2 | 33.3 |
| Scotland | 30 | 7 | 2.8 | 23.3 |
| Canada | 29 | 6 | 2.4 | 20.6 |
| France | 19 | 6 | 2.4 | 31.6 |
| Other† | 15 | 7 | 0.4 | 46.7 |

*"E" signifies the total number of individuals from the respective country of origin.

**Percentage derived by dividing number of desertions by total number of individuals from each ethnic group.

†Includes deserters originally from Switzerland (two), Poland (two), Sweden, Italy, and Holland (one each).

Table 4.14. Means of Death Among Five-Year and Duration Enlistees, 1845-48.

| Date | N | Combat* N | Combat* % | Illness N | Illness % | Other N | Other % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1845 and 1846 (Pre-War through campaigns in Northern Mexico) | | | | | | | |
| Five Year Enlistees** | 11 | 4 | 1.6 | - | - | 7† | 2.7 |
| January through September, 1847 (Troops placed under General Scott, assault at Vera Cruz, campaigns in Central Mexico) | | | | | | | |
| Five Year Enlistees | 91 | 30 | 11.7 | 57 | 22.1 | 5†† | 1.9 |
| Duration Enlistees | 45 | 3 | 1.2 | 41 | 16.0 | 1‡ | 0.4 |
| Total | 137 | 33 | 12.9 | 98 | 38.1 | 6 | 2.3 |
| October 1847 through June 1848 (Occupation of Mexico City) | | | | | | | |
| Five Year Enlistees | 28 | - | - | 27 | 10.5 | 1‡ | 0.4 |
| Duration Enlistees | 59 | - | - | 59 | 23.1 | - | - |
| Total | 87 | - | - | 86 | 33.6 | 1 | 0.4 |
| July through December 1848 (Return to United States) | | | | | | | |
| Five Year Enlistees | 17 | - | - | 15 | 5.9 | 2‡‡ | 0.8 |
| Duration Enlistees | 4 | - | - | 4 | 1.6 | - | |
| Total | 21 | - | - | 19 | 7.5 | 2 | 0.8 |
| Grand Total | 256 | 37 | 14.5 | 203 | 79.2 | 16 | 6.2 |

* Includes those killed in action as well as those who subsequently died of wounds.

** No enlistees "for the duration of the War" were raised prior to 11 February 1847.

† 6 drowned, 1 shot while attempting to desert.

†† All executed by order of General Court Martial, being members of the Batallon de San Patricio.

‡ Killed by rabble in Mexico City.

‡‡Drowned en route to Jefferson Barracks, Missouri.

Table 4.15. Desertion and Deaths Compared by Enlistment Type, 1845-1848.

| | | Desertions | | Deaths | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of Enlistment | N | N | % | N | % |
| 5-year | 873 | 244 | 27.9 | 158 | 18.1 |
| Duration of War | 534 | 25 | 4.7 | 106 | 20.1 |
| Totals | 1407 | 269 | 19.1 | 264 | 18.8 |

Table 5.1. Strength: U.S. Army and Seventh Infantry Regiment, 1849-60.

| Strength | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U.S. Army | | 7th Regiment | | |
| year | authorized | actual | authorized | actual | % of Army |
| 1849 | 10,310 | 10,585* | 558 | 496 | 4.9 |
| 1850 | 10,317 | 10,763** | " | 491 | 4.6 |
| 1851 | " | 10,538 | " | 462 | 4.4 |
| 1852 | " | 11,202 | " | 398 | 3.6 |
| 1853 | " | 10,417 | " | 515 | 4.9 |
| 1854 | " | 10,745 | " | 357 | 3.3 |
| 1855 | 12,698 | 15,752 | " | 641† | 4.1 |
| 1856 | " | 15,562 | " | 676 | 4.3 |
| 1857 | " | 15,764 | " | 615 | 3.9 |
| 1858 | " | 17,498 | " | 825 | 4.7 |
| 1859 | " | 16,435 | " | 802 | 4.9 |
| 1860 | " | 16,367 | " | 625 | 3.8 |

Table 5.1. Continued.

*The Second Infantry was authorized to have 64 men per company (by act of 14 August 1848), whereas the other regiments were only authorized 39, resulting in the greater number of men in uniform than officially authorized.

**Strength in excess of authorized strength was permitted under Act of 17 June 1850, which allowed the President to increase the number of privates in any company serving on the frontier to 74, whenever deemed necessary. See John Callan, Military Laws of the United States, Relating to the Army, Volunteers, and Militia, and to Bounty Lands and Pensions, From the Founding of the Government to 3 March 1863 (Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1863), 405-06.

† Beginning in 1855, the companies of the Seventh Infantry stationed at Forts Gibson (D,E, and F) and Arbuckle (C,G,H and K) were increased under the Act of 17 June 1850. The number of companies increased fluctuated between 3 and 8 until 1858, when all companies were increased for service in Utah.

Sources: Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1849-60; Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903; reprint, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965), 2: 594-97: Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, National Archives, Record Group 94, Microcopy 665, Rolls 23-28.

Table 5.2. Comparison of National and Regimental Recruiting Efforts, 1849-1860.

| | Recruits | |
|---|---|---|
| year | U.S. Army | 7th Regiment |
| 1849 | 5,197 | 104 |
| 1850 | 3,695 | 40 |
| 1851 | 4,567 | 58 |
| 1852 | 4,174 | 17 |
| 1853 | 2,865 | 21 |
| 1854 | 4,221 | 23 |
| 1855 | 10,546 | 19 |
| 1856 | 4,440 | 55 |
| 1857 | 5,420 | 63 |
| 1858 | 8,204 | 55 |
| 1859 | 4,074 | 18 |
| 1860 | 4,733 | 131 |

Source: Secretary of War, Annual Reports, 1849-1860; Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, National Archives, Record Group 94, Microcopy 665, rolls 23-28.

Table 5.3. Ages at Enlistment in the Seventh Regiment, 1849-1860.

| Year | Age (mean) | Native | Immigrant |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1849 | 24.76 (298) | 25.58 (72) | 24.38 (226) |
| 1850 | 25.47 (129 of 130) | 25.90 (51) | 25.18 (78) |
| 1851 | 25.60 (112 of 113) | 25.27 (26) | 25.70 (86) |
| 1852 | 24.52 (280 of 281) | 24.35 (49) | 24.55 (231) |
| 1853 | 26.71 (28 of 28) | 25.00 (10) | 27.67 (18) |
| 1854 | 24.69 (235 of 236) | 25.00 (39) | 24.62 (196) |
| 1855 | 23.69 (344 of 345) | 23.76 (59) | 23.68 (285) |
| 1856 | 27.78 (46 of 49) | 25.56 (16) | 28.97 (30) |
| 1857 | 24.89 (275 of 276) | 23.13 (67) | 25.46 (208) |
| 1858 | 23.78 (250) | 22.77 (70) | 24.18 (180) |
| 1859 | 28.20 (98 of 99) | 27.07 (14) | 28.39 (84) |
| 1860 | 25.13 (247) | 23.8 (55) | 25.51 (192 |

Note: The data in tables 5.3-5.16 are compiled from Registers of Enlistments, U.S. Army, National Archives, Record Group 94, Microcopy 665, Rolls 23-28.

Table 5.4. Birthplaces of all Recruits, 1849-1860.

| Year | Native-Born | | Foreign Born | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| 1849 | 72 | 24.2 | 226 | 75.8 |
| 1850 | 51 | 39.5 | 78 | 60.5 |
| 1851 | 26 | 23.2 | 86 | 76.8 |
| 1852 | 49 | 17.5 | 231 | 82.5 |
| 1853 | 10 | 35.7 | 18 | 64.3 |
| 1854 | 39 | 16.6 | 196 | 83.4 |
| 1855 | 59 | 17.2 | 285 | 82.8 |
| 1856 | 16 | 34.8 | 30 | 65.2 |
| 1857 | 67 | 24.4 | 208 | 75.6 |
| 1858 | 70 | 28.0 | 180 | 72.0 |
| 1859 | 14 | 14.3 | 84 | 85.7 |
| 1860 | 55 | 22.3 | 192 | 77.7 |
| Totals | 528 | 22.5 | 1814 | 77.5 |

Table 5.5. Birthplaces of Native-Born Recruits, 1849-1860.

| State | 1849 | | 1850 | | 1851 | | 1852 | | 1853 | | 1854 | | 1855 | | 1856 | | 1857 | | 1858 | | 1859 | | 1860 | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| Maine | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 2.0 | 4 | 15.4 | 3 | 6.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 6.2 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 4.3 | - | - | 3 | 5.7 | 17 | 3.8 |
| New Hampshire | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | 20.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2.9 | - | - | - | - | 5 | .9 |
| Vermont | 3 | 4.3 | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 10.0 | 1 | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3.1 | 2 | 2.9 | - | - | 2 | 3.8 | 13 | 2.5 |
| Massachusetts | 7 | 9.8 | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | 2 | 4.3 | - | - | 2 | 5.2 | 1 | 1.6 | - | - | 3 | 4.6 | 6 | 8.6 | - | - | 13 | 24.5 | 35 | 6.7 |
| Rhode Island | - | - | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | .4 |
| Connecticut | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 10.0 | - | - | 4 | 6.4 | - | - | 2 | 3.1 | 5 | 7.1 | - | - | 1 | 1.9 | 15 | 2.9 |
| Totals | 12 | 16.9 | 5 | 10.0 | 4 | 15.4 | 7 | 14.9 | 4 | 40.0 | 3 | 7.8 | 5 | 8.0 | 1 | 6.2 | 8 | 12.3 | 18 | 25.8 | - | - | 20 | 37.8 | 87 | 16.7 |
| New York | 23 | 32.4 | 13 | 26.0 | 3 | 11.5 | 14 | 29.7 | 3 | 30.0 | 9 | 24.0 | 16 | 26.3 | 5 | 31.3 | 23 | 35.6 | 20 | 28.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 18 | 33.8 | 149 | 28.8 |
| New Jersey | 2 | 2.8 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.1 | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 3.2 | - | - | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 4.3 | - | - | 1 | 1.9 | 11 | 2.1 |
| Pennsylvania | 16 | 22.5 | 13 | 26.0 | 3 | 11.5 | 10 | 21.3 | 2 | 20.0 | 9 | 24.0 | 9 | 14.5 | 1 | 6.2 | 10 | 15.4 | 12 | 17.1 | 2 | 14.3 | 3 | 5.7 | 90 | 17.2 |
| Totals | 41 | 57.7 | 26 | 52.0 | 6 | 23.0 | 25 | 53.1 | 5 | 50.0 | 19 | 50.6 | 27 | 44.0 | 6 | 37.5 | 34 | 52.5 | 35 | 50.1 | 4 | 28.6 | 22 | 41.4 | 250 | 48.1 |
| Delaware | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.1 |
| Maryland* | 3 | 4.2 | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 7.7 | 1 | 2.1 | - | - | - | - | 6 | 9.6 | 2 | 12.6 | - | - | 2 | 2.9 | 1 | 7.1 | 2 | 3.8 | 20 | 3.8 |
| Virginia | 4 | 5.7 | 4 | 8.0 | 1 | 3.8 | 4 | 8.6 | - | - | 2 | 5.2 | 5 | 8.0 | - | - | 4 | 6.1 | 3 | 4.3 | 2 | 14.3 | - | - | 29 | 5.6 |
| North Carolina | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.8 | 1 | 2.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.4 |
| South Carolina | - | - | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | 1 | 2.1 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 0.8 |
| Georgia | - | - | 3 | 6.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.9 |
| Florida | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 5.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.4 |
| Alabama | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 6.2 | 1 | 1.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0.6 |
| Mississippi | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 4.8 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 1.9 | 7 | 1.3 |
| Louisiana | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 10.0 | - | - | 2 | 3.2 | - | - | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 0.9 |
| Arkansas** | 2 | 2.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | 4 | 0.8 |
| Texas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Totals | 9 | 12.7 | 9 | 18.0 | 7 | 14.9 | 7 | 14.9 | 1 | 10.0 | 6 | 15.6 | 19 | 30.4 | 4 | 25.0 | 6 | 9.1 | 9 | 12.8 | 4 | 28.6 | 4 | 7.6 | 84 | 16.0 |
| Michigan | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.1 |
| Ohio | 4 | 5.7 | 5 | 10.0 | 5 | 19.4 | 3 | 6.4 | - | - | 6 | 15.6 | 4 | 6.4 | 3 | 18.9 | 8 | 12.3 | 4 | 5.7 | 4 | 28.6 | 5 | 9.4 | 51 | 9.8 |
| Indiana | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 4.3 | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.5 | - | - | 1 | 7.1 | - | - | 5 | 0.9 |
| Illinois | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | 7 | 1.3 |
| Missouri | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | 2 | 7.7 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 3.2 | 1 | 6.2 | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 7.1 | - | - | 10 | 1.9 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | 2.0 | 3 | 11.5 | 3 | 6.4 | - | - | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.6 | - | - | 5 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | - | - | 17 | 3.3 |
| Tennessee | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 2.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3.2 | 1 | 6.2 | 2 | 3.1 | 1 | 1.4 | - | - | 2 | 3.8 | 10 | 1.9 |
| Totals | 9 | 12.7 | 10 | 20.0 | 10 | 38.6 | 8 | 17.1 | - | - | 10 | 26.0 | 11 | 17.6 | 5 | 31.3 | 17 | 26.1 | 8 | 11.3 | 6 | 42.8 | 7 | 13.2 | 101 | 19.2 |
| Grand Totals | 71 | 100.0 | 50 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 | 47 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 38 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 14 | 100.0 | 53 | 100.0 | 522 | 100.0 |

*includes Washington D.C.
**includes Indian Territory

Table 5.6. Birthplaces of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1849-1860.

| Country | 1849 | | 1850 | | 1851 | | 1852 | | 1853 | | 1854 | | 1855 | | 1856 | | 1857 | | 1858 | | 1859 | | 1860 | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| Canada | 3 | 1.4 | 2 | 2.6 | - | - | 2 | 0.9 | - | - | 2 | 1.1 | 3 | 1.0 | - | - | 6 | 3.0 | 8 | 4.6 | 1 | 1.2 | 10 | 5.3 | 37 | 2.1 |
| England | 21 | 9.4 | 8 | 10.3 | 5 | 5.8 | 22 | 9.5 | - | - | 8 | 4.1 | 16 | 5.6 | 1 | 3.2 | 14 | 7.1 | 14 | 8.2 | 6 | 7.2 | 10 | 5.3 | 125 | 6.9 |
| Scotland | 8 | 3.6 | 1 | 1.3 | 3 | 3.4 | 7 | 3.0 | - | - | 9 | 4.6 | 8 | 2.8 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 1.6 | 40 | 2.2 |
| Wales | - | - | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.6 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 1.6 | 10 | >.1 |
| Ireland | 156 | 69.3 | 46 | 58.9 | 57 | 66.3 | 117 | 51.3 | 12 | 66.7 | 111 | 56.8 | 159 | 55.6 | 15 | 48.5 | 118 | 59.3 | 90 | 52.6 | 55 | 66.3 | 126 | 66.3 | 1062 | 59.3 |
| Belgium | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 5 | >.1 |
| Holland | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 5 | >.1 |
| Switzerland | 2 | 0.9 | - | - | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | .5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.5 | 10 | >.1 |
| Germany | 31 | 13.8 | 17 | 21.8 | 18 | 20.9 | 69 | 30.2 | 4 | 22.2 | 57 | 29.2 | 83 | 29.0 | 12 | 38.7 | 53 | 26.6 | 48 | 28.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 26 | 13.7 | 437 | 24.4 |
| Austria | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | >.1 |
| Poland | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.9 | 2 | 11.1 | - | - | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | 7 | >.1 |
| France | 1 | 0.4 | 3 | 3.8 | - | - | 2 | 0.9 | - | - | 3 | 1.5 | 7 | 2.4 | 1 | 3.2 | 2 | 1.0 | 4 | 2.23 | 1 | 1.2 | 4 | 2.1 | 28 | 1.6 |
| Italy | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.1 | - | - | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1.1 | 7 | >.1 |
| Norway | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >.1 |
| Sweden | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | 2 | >.1 |
| Hungary | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | >.1 |
| Denmark | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 0.6 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.6 | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 6 | >.1 |
| Russia | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | >.1 |
| West Indies | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | >.1 |
| at Sea | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | >.1 |
| Totals | 225 | 100.0 | 78 | 100.0 | 86 | 100.0 | 228 | 100.0 | 18 | 100.0 | 195 | 100.0 | 286 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 | 199 | 100.0 | 171 | 100.0 | 83 | 100.0 | 190 | 100.0 | 1790 | 100.0 |

Table 5.7. Occupations of All Recruits, 1849-1860.

| Occupation | 1849 | | 1850 | | 1851 | | 1852 | | 1853 | | 1854 | | 1855 | | 1856 | | 1857 | | 1858 | | 1859 | | 1860 | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 110 | 36.9 | 50 | 38.8 | 39 | 34.8 | 124 | 44.4 | 6 | 21.4 | 104 | 44.4 | 135 | 39.1 | 9 | 19.6 | 81 | 29.8 | 81 | 32.8 | 11 | 11.2 | 67 | 27.1 | 817 | 35.0 |
| Farmer | 18 | 6.0 | 7 | 5.4 | 7 | 6.3 | 24 | 8.6 | - | - | 4 | 1.7 | 8 | 2.3 | 4 | 8.7 | 23 | 8.4 | 26 | 10.5 | 4 | 4.1 | 20 | 8.1 | 145 | 6.2 |
| Soldier | 44 | 14.8 | 32 | 24.8 | 30 | 26.8 | 24 | 8.6 | 17 | 60.8 | 35 | 14.9 | 42 | 12.2 | 20 | 43.5 | 54 | 19.9 | 12 | 4.9 | 72 | 73.5 | 65 | 26.3 | 447 | 19.1 |
| Seaman | 5 | 1.7 | - | - | 1 | 0.9 | 8 | 2.9 | - | - | 3 | 1.3 | 4 | 1.2 | - | - | 7 | 2.6 | 4 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.0 | 9 | 3.6 | 42 | 1.8 |
| Artisan | 94 | 31.5 | 30 | 23.2 | 26 | 23.2 | 81 | 29.0 | 3 | 10.7 | 77 | 33.0 | 138 | 40.0 | 11 | 23.9 | 89 | 32.7 | 106 | 42.9 | 9 | 9.2 | 78 | 31.6 | 742 | 31.8 |
| Other | 27 | 9.1 | 10 | 7.8 | 9 | 8.0 | 18 | 6.5 | 2 | 7.1 | 11 | 4.7 | 18 | 5.2 | 2 | 4.3 | 18 | 6.6 | 18 | 7.3 | 1 | 1.0 | 8 | 3.3 | 142 | 6.1 |
| Totals | 298 | 100.0 | 129 | 100.0 | 112 | 100.0 | 279 | 100.0 | 28 | 100.0 | 234 | 100.0 | 345 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 | 272 | 100.0 | 247 | 100.0 | 98 | 100.0 | 247 | 100.0 | 2335 | 100.0 |

Table 5.8. Occupations of Native-Born Recruits, 1849-1860.

| Occupation | 1849 | | 1850 | | 1851 | | 1852 | | 1853 | | 1854 | | 1855 | | 1856 | | 1857 | | 1858 | | 1859 | | 1860 | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 9 | 12.5 | 14 | 26.9 | 10 | 38.5 | 14 | 28.2 | 2 | 20.0 | 11 | 28.9 | 16 | 27.1 | 3 | 18.8 | 12 | 18.5 | 13 | 18.6 | 1 | 7.7 | 5 | 9.1 | 110 | 20.9 |
| Farmer | 7 | 9.7 | 7 | 12.9 | 3 | 11.5 | 5 | 10.4 | - | - | 2 | 5.3 | 3 | 5.1 | 3 | 18.8 | 13 | 20.0 | 12 | 17.1 | 1 | 7.7 | 8 | 14.6 | 64 | 12.1 |
| Soldier | 24 | 33.3 | 16 | 27.7 | 8 | 30.8 | 4 | 8.3 | 7 | 70.0 | 8 | 21.1 | 11 | 18.7 | 5 | 31.2 | 5 | 7.7 | 2 | 2.9 | 9 | 69.2 | 13 | 23.6 | 112 | 21.3 |
| Seaman | 2 | 2.8 | - | - | - | - | 4 | 8.3 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3.4 | - | - | 5 | 7.7 | 2 | 2.9 | - | - | 4 | 7.3 | 19 | 3.6 |
| Artisan | 21 | 29.2 | 14 | 26.9 | 3 | 11.5 | 20 | 41.7 | - | - | 16 | 42.1 | 23 | 38.9 | 5 | 31.2 | 27 | 41.5 | 34 | 48.5 | 2 | 15.4 | 23 | 41.8 | 188 | 35.8 |
| Other | 9 | 12.5 | 3 | 5.6 | 2 | 7.7 | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 10.0 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 6.8 | - | - | 3 | 4.6 | 7 | 10.0 | - | - | 2 | 3.6 | 33 | 6.3 |
| Totals | 72 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 38 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 65 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 13 | 100.0 | 55 | 100.0 | 526 | 100.0 |

Table 5.9. Occupations of Foreign-Born Recruits, 1849-1860.

| Occupation | 1849 | | 1850 | | 1851 | | 1852 | | 1853 | | 1854 | | 1855 | | 1856 | | 1857 | | 1858 | | 1859 | | 1860 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Laborer | 101 | 44.7 | 36 | 46.2 | 29 | 33.7 | 110 | 47.6 | 4 | 22.2 | 93 | 47.4 | 119 | 41.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 69 | 33.3 | 68 | 38.4 | 10 | 11.9 | 62 | 32.3 | 707 | 39.1 |
| Farmer | 11 | 4.9 | 3 | 3.8 | 4 | 4.7 | 19 | 8.3 | - | - | 2 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 10 | 4.8 | 14 | 7.9 | 3 | 3.6 | 12 | 6.2 | 84 | 4.6 |
| Soldier | 20 | 8.8 | 16 | 20.5 | 22 | 25.6 | 20 | 8.7 | 10 | 55.6 | 27 | 13.8 | 31 | 10.8 | 15 | 50.0 | 49 | 23.7 | 10 | 5.6 | 62 | 73.8 | 52 | 27.1 | 334 | 18.4 |
| Seaman | 3 | 1.3 | - | - | 1 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.7 | - | - | 3 | 1.5 | 2 | 0.7 | - | - | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 5 | 2.6 | 23 | 1.3 |
| Artisan | 73 | 32.3 | 16 | 20.5 | 23 | 26.7 | 60 | 25.9 | 3 | 16.7 | 61 | 31.2 | 115 | 40.2 | 6 | 20.0 | 62 | 29.9 | 72 | 40.7 | 7 | 8.3 | 55 | 28.7 | 553 | 30.5 |
| Clerical | 18 | 8.0 | 7 | 8.9 | 7 | 8.1 | 18 | 7.3 | 1 | 5.5 | 10 | 5.1 | 14 | 4.9 | 2 | 6.7 | 15 | 7.3 | 11 | 6.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 6 | 3.1 | 110 | 6.1 |
| Totals | 226 | 100.0 | 78 | 100.0 | 86 | 100.0 | 231 | 100.0 | 196 | 100.0 | 286 | 100.0 | 286 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 207 | 100.0 | 177 | 100.0 | 84 | 100.0 | 192 | 100.0 | 1,811 | 100.0 |

Table 5.10. Conclusion of Service of Recruits, 1849-1860, by Means Other than Discharge.

| Year of | Strength | Reenlistments | | Desertions | | Deaths | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enlistment | N | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| 1849 | 496 | 12 | 2.4 | 46 | 9.3 | 37 | 7.5 |
| 1850 | 491 | 13 | 2.6 | 104 | 21.2 | 32 | 6.5 |
| 1851 | 462 | 12 | 2.6 | 62 | 13.4 | 18 | 3.9 |
| 1852 | 398 | 2 | 0.5 | 45 | 11.3 | 19 | 4.8 |
| 1853 | 515 | 11 | 2.1 | 85 | 16.5 | 29 | 5.6 |
| 1854 | 357 | 21 | 5.9 | 28 | 7.8 | 10 | 2.8 |
| 1855 | 641 | 19 | 2.9 | 34 | 5.3 | 34 | 5.3 |
| 1856 | 676 | 11 | 1.6 | 61 | 9.0 | 14 | 2.1 |
| 1857 | 615 | 51 | 8.3 | 48 | 7.8 | 4 | 0.7 |
| 1858 | 825 | 6 | 0.7 | 81 | 9.8 | 10 | 1.2 |
| 1859 | 802 | 83 | 10.3 | 25 | 3.1 | 9 | 1.1 |
| 1860 | 625 | 48 | 7.7 | 45 | 7.2 | 11 | 1.8 |
| Totals | 6903 | 289 | 4.1 | 1006 | 14.5 | 227 | 3.3 |

Table 5.11. Time in Service Prior to First Desertion, 1849-1860.

| Period Before First Desertion | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Less than One Year | 350 | 56.3 |
| Less than Two Years | 171 | 27.6 |
| Less Than Three Years | 84 | 13.2 |
| Less than Four Years | 17 | 2.9 |
| Less than Five Years | 2 | >.1 |
| Totals | 624 | 100.0 |

Table 5.12. Age of Deserters from the Seventh Regiment, 1849-1860.

| Age at Desertion | N | (%) | Age at Desertion | N | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 and under | 8 | 1.2 | 27 | 32 | 5.2 |
| 19 | 10 | 1.6 | 28 | 34 | 5.5 |
| 20 | 13 | 2.1 | 29 | 17 | 2.7 |
| 21 | 125 | 21.4 | 30 | 14 | 2.2 |
| 22 | 98 | 15.8 | 31 | 15 | 2.4 |
| 23 | 62 | 10.0 | 32 | 12 | 1.9 |
| 24 | 65 | 10.5 | 33 | 11 | 1.7 |
| 25 | 50 | 8.1 | 34 and over | 6 | 0.1 |
| 26 | 47 | 7.6 | | | |

Table 5.13. Record of Deserters, 1849-1860.

| Status | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Deserted, did not return | 512 | 85.7 |
| Deserted, apprehended and concluded term | 42 | 6.9 |
| Multiple desertions | 44 | 7.3 |
| Multiple Desertions, apprehended and concluded term | 6 | 0.1 |
| Totals | 604 | 100.0 |

Table 5.14. Reenlistments and Desertions Before and After Passage of "An Act to Increase the Pay of the Army, and to Encourage Enlistments," 4 August 1854.

| Time | Strength | Reenlistments | | Desertions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (total) | N | % | N | % |
| Prior to 4 August 1854 | 2,362 | 50 | 2.1 | 342 | 14.5 |
| After 4 August 1854 | 4,541 | 239 | 5.3 | 664 | 14.6 |
| Totals | 6,903 | 289 | 4.2 | 1,006 | 14.6 |

Table 5.15. Age of Reenlistees in the Seventh Regiment, 1849-1860.

| Age at Reenlistment | N | (%) | Age at Reenlistment | N | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 2 | 0.7 | 33 | 13 | 4.4 |
| 19 | 1 | 0.3 | 34 | 3 | 1.0 |
| 20 | 2 | 0.7 | 35 | 14 | 4.7 |
| 21 | 1 | 0.3 | 36 | 6 | 2.0 |
| 22 | - | - | 37 | 12 | 4.1 |
| 23 | 8 | 2.7 | 38 | 9 | 3.0 |
| 24 | 4 | 1.4 | 39 | 6 | 2.0 |
| 25 | 3 | 1.0 | 40 | 9 | 3.0 |
| 26 | 57 | 19.3 | 41 | 5 | 1.7 |
| 27 | 33 | 11.1 | 42 | 5 | 1.7 |
| 28 | 23 | 7.8 | 43 | 2 | 0.7 |
| 29 | 22 | 7.4 | 44 | 2 | 0.7 |
| 30 | 18 | 6.1 | 45 | 6 | 2.0 |
| 31 | 16 | 5.4 | 46 and over | 4 | 1.4 |
| 32 | 10 | 3.4 | | | |

Table 5.16. Former Occupation of Reenlistees, 1849-60.

| Occupation | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Laborer | 101 | 34.1 |
| Farmer | 10 | 3.4 |
| Soldier | 100 | 33.8 |
| Seaman | 5 | 1.7 |
| Artisan | 66 | 22.3 |
| Other | 14 | 4.7 |
| Totals | 296 | 100.0 |

# VITA

Robert Paul Wettemann, Jr. received a Bachelor of Arts with Honors in History from Oklahoma State University in May 1993. He has served as a Teaching Assistant at Texas A&M University since August 1995. His permanent mailing address is:

300 B Manuel Drive

College Station, TX 77840