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I. Introduction

In the spring of 1918, New Hampshire College, a land-grant agricultural college in the small town of Durham, NH, transformed into a vocational army training camp. Facing a severe shortage of vocational experts upon entering World War I, the U.S. War Department had contracted with 157 universities and schools to form the National Army Training Detachments, whose mission was to train college-age draftees in 66 critical army trades. Colleges across the country re-drew their campus maps and reorganized their course schedules to accommodate these vocational trainees, as the U.S. Army placed its staff in professors’ offices and converted dormitories into barracks.¹

The first detachment arrived at New Hampshire College on May 16, 1918. Most of these 341 New Hampshire men trained as mechanics, truck drivers, carpenters, and electricians, while a small number spent their two months at the camp learning the trades of concrete workers, blacksmiths, machinists, engine workers, and military clerks. Over the course of the summer and through the end of the war in November 1918, over one thousand college-aged men from New Hampshire and New York passed through the camp. Although several were former students of New Hampshire College, the majority had never before attended a university or trade school. One-fifth of the men had never completed elementary school.²

The archaeological potential of the New Hampshire College training camp site was realized in 2012, as part of a University of New Hampshire campus archaeology course. The site of the camp’s barracks was of particular interest. Between May and July 1918, the students at the

² “Distribution of Soldiers,” UA 17/16; Dooley, 96.
training camp had constructed two barracks on the side of Bonfire Hill (now known as the MUB hill), providing their own housing and gaining practical experience in army trades. New Hampshire College (which changed its name to the “University of New Hampshire” in 1923) acquired the barracks and converted them to all-male dormitories. These dorms, designated East Hall and West Hall, served UNH’s housing needs until 1971, when the university, citing structural problems, ordered that they be demolished. Although the university originally intended to turn the area into additional parking space for the Memorial Union Building, former residents and other students protested, insisting that the site become a much-needed “green space.” A plaque fastened to a boulder near the MUB still recognizes the space as East-West Park, apparently oblivious to the numerous sidewalks and stairways that have continually subdivided the hill over the past forty years.3

Beneath the grassy surface of the hill are the material remains of the barracks – both the structural debris from the buildings themselves, and the items thrown away by the residents during the buildings’ occupation. Although some of these materials can certainly tell stories about student life after the war, this paper is concerned with the cultural behavior of the site’s World War I occupants. This type of military site has never before been archaeologically studied, and the vocational program that brought it into existence has largely been forgotten. Military camps, and the lower-rank men who inhabited them, are an under-researched topic in archaeology. As Clarence Geier, Lawrence Babits, Douglas Scott, and David Orr note in their 2010 compilation of methods in historical military archaeology,

…little effort [has been] made to understand armies as human communities or address the lives of those who comprised them… In tying a group of men to the successes and failures of particular leaders, there is a dramatic failure to see those

groups as distinct social units and, in some instances, self-supporting societies structured around a defined social hierarchy, regulated by law, needing to be supplied and nurtured, and often at odds with the human community of the occupied lands. 4

In June 1918, New Hampshire College training camp’s vocational soldiers began building two barracks. They were designed to house 200 men each, and were the work of the camp’s carpentry and concrete squads. They both solved the camp’s housing shortage and provided hands-on training in military professions (photo courtesy of UNH Archives, Clement Moran photography collection).

Although the New Hampshire College site is a camp of a different sort, distinct from encampments built along battle lines, this thesis holds. The campus, and, by extension, the surrounding town, did in fact become “occupied” by the army: the college newspaper came under government control, while the War Department introduced new war-themed courses and filed priority order forms with local businesses. Like field camps in earlier wars, the World War I college training camp was indeed a “distinct social unit… regulated by law, needing to be

---

supplied and nurtured, and often at odds with the… community.” Combining archaeological and
documentary evidence, the training camp’s wartime culture may be investigated using three
major approaches:

*Construction methods*, as represented by the barracks’ structural remains, help
reveal the educational ideology in place at the camp. They raise such questions as,
“How well were the buildings constructed? Did the students learn and practice
appropriate architectural techniques? Did they using the best-quality materials, or
did the program make do with lower-cost materials?” These questions investigate
the camp’s hierarchy, including the War Department’s opinions of the vocational
men’s educational needs, as well as the students’ and professors’ attitudes toward
quality work and acceptable work ethic.

*Materials used* illustrate patterns of local interaction and economic trade. With the
assistance of archival documentation including the camp’s order forms, archaeology can
investigate where items were purchased, while also analyzing the quality and typology of
those items. Items not found in order forms but present in the archaeological record can
also be investigated through other forms of documentation, including trade journals, and
illustrate wartime efforts of rationing and saving.

*Discard patterns* have the greatest potential to reveal the soldiers’ own behavior and
ideology. The type of items used and discarded can illustrate class structure and leisure
behavior, and potentially present a lifestyle that differs from the wartime ideal of good
soldierly behavior.

Using documentation as a point of departure, these types of investigation assist in understanding
the ways in which the camp conformed to or departed from official expectations.

While the site’s integrity has, of course, been disturbed by demolition and landscaping, this
combination of the archaeological record and archival documentation uncovers the history of this
forgotten moment of government control of American colleges. The rate of damage inherent in
campus development, along with the limited number of colleges that constructed new buildings
under the National Army Vocational Detachment program, means that the number of such
training camp sites is rapidly decreasing. It is only a matter of luck that the University of New
Hampshire decided against paving over the site, leaving it accessible for excavation today. Other campus sites may not have been as fortunate.

This study, the first excavation of a college camp, presents an opportunity for an in-depth view of the lives of a forgotten class of American men. Through the Training Detachments across the country, working-class men came together to form new, composite communities of drafted, previously unrelated individuals. They were bound together by wartime ideals of what it meant to be American. They, along with the soldiers at the front and the industrial workers at arms factories, had a common goal, stamped across posters and tacked onto speeches and lectures: *do your bit* and *win the war*. They became part of the ideal of a geographically bounded, ideologically connected national community. Such a community “is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”\(^5\) With the interaction of New Hampshire and New York men at the camp, some of these “fellow-members” did get to meet each other, but they became part of a much larger system wherein education, government, commerce, and local populations worked together for victory.

Under the new system, educational ideals and college traditions were “pulled apart.” The Princeton Alumni Magazine, commenting on their training camp, remarked, “every day Princeton becomes less an academic college and more a school of war.” The President of the University of Arizona commented that “curriculum and traditions have been literally pulled to pieces,” while at the University of Illinois, 3000 men moved into fraternity houses for the

duration of their training. This system asked new questions about American identity. What was the story of “American” history that led to involvement in the war? What were the responsibilities of a university - or of a student - in wartime? What was the duty of a vocational man to his country?

The New Hampshire vocational men and the university professors-turned-mentors were faced with these questions daily. With the increased presence of military officers on campus, they were expected to know and behave according to the appropriate answers. Even the women on campus, according to the college newspaper, were expected to follow strict military discipline “as a patriotic measure in coördinance with the strict discipline of the men.” On this point, however, it is important to remember the previously noted theory of training camps: that they are “human communities” and “distinct social units” that behave according to their own rules, and do not necessarily adhere to the expectations of the outside culture. Student training camps, relying on the interrelated duties of states, educational institutions, businesses, government, and individuals, certainly play into an American wartime imagined community, but focusing on expectations tells only half of the story. Documentary and archaeological evidence reveal not only the standards of this imagined community, but also serve to remind us that beyond the imagined standards, real, active communities of people existed within the war effort – and that their behavior did not always conformed to the imagined standards.

---

II.

Creation and Development of the College Training Camp Programs

Soon after entering the war, the United States War Department noticed a major issue with their method of drafting soldiers. While the Department had assumed that the random selection by draft would automatically provide the necessary number of mechanics, engineers, and other vocational men, it quickly became apparent that this method had a tendency to send skilled men to the front lines rather than to where they were needed most. In the summer of 1917, a “committee on the classification of personnel” started a census of the Army draftees’ previous occupations and training. The committee did not need to finish this report “before it became apparent that the draft was failing by a very large per cent to bring into the service the technicians required for ordinary military operations” – only 6% of the surveyed men could be classified as “experts” in their field - and that the current method of acquiring specialists was taking trained men away from home camps and war industries where their skills were absolutely necessary.\(^8\) Prior to the survey, the War Department had no specific processes for recruiting and appointing specialists. As late as January 1918, New Hampshire College was publishing War Department letters in *The New Hampshire* newspaper, requesting the names of “men well fitted to serve the government as mechanical engineers, mechanical draftsmen, engineers, and electricians,” to be drawn from men in the college’s faculty, alumni, or “acquaintance.”\(^9\)

Meanwhile, colleges across the country began to complain of being “drained” of their skilled individuals. Early programs deferring drafted engineering students from immediate duty allowed engineering schools to retain the majority of their students, but by 1918, agricultural schools like


New Hampshire College were losing an average of one-third of their students.\(^{10}\) A *New Hampshire* article from January 1918 lamented the waste of these men’s skills: “Although the undergraduates of technical schools were better fitted for munitions and ship building work, 16 per cent of them did not wait to finish their training at school but entered the service at the declaration of war.” Between this voluntary enlistment, the selective service act, and other voluntary war work, almost half of all New England college students were in some way involved in the war effort by early 1918.\(^{11}\)

With schools inching toward collapse, college presidents began pressuring President Wilson to allow students to complete their studies, predicting that the country would need those “experts” to help with rebuilding after the war. College brochures, in an attempt to attract new students, explained that tuition was an “investment” in post-war opportunities.\(^{12}\) Taking up this rhetoric, President Wilson issued a bulletin stating that after the war, demand “for trained men in all lines – financial, economical, social, and industrial – will be ten times greater than it ever has been before. Where will the trained men come from if the colleges are depleted?”\(^{13}\) In the summer of 1917, Secretary of War Newton Baker created an Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense to study the military’s need for trained vocational men.

By the next year, the War Department had a plan. On February 2, 1918, President Wilson issued Order 15, an act that “formalized the army’s links to the higher education community.” Contracting with colleges, technical schools, and few high schools, the War Department created the National Army Training Detachments. Draft boards were asked to defer “experts” and students, and allow them to participate in this program to “give soldiers intensive training in

---


\(^{12}\) Levine 25.

\(^{13}\) Levine 26.
short courses along the lines of the greatest need of the army.”

Draftees of college age could request to be sent to a training detachment; several potential candidates even wrote directly to New Hampshire College’s head of vocational training, Dean C. E. Hewitt, requesting admission. Although the best the Dean could do was to refer these young men to their local draft boards, he received letters through the end of the war from young men across New Hampshire (and one from Massachusetts), requesting information on how to join the vocational division. Some expressed their desire to use their trades in serving their country, while others were interested in gaining new skills. The motivation of others is summarized by the Dean’s reply to one young man’s request to join the officer’s training camp that was installed shortly after the vocational division: “my advice to you is, to enroll … at some Institution of collegiate grade, as your status… will be much better than if you simply wait for the draft, as you will probable in that case be sent to the front as an ordinary private.” The vocational men would not become “ordinary privates;” they could pursue what Hewitt perceived as a relatively safe alternative to front-line battle.

Just as some soldiers undoubtedly saw the vocational camps as an opportunity to get through the war alive, colleges realized that without the War Department’s men and money, their draft-depleted institutions would not survive the year. With the vocational units and, later, the Students’ Army Training Corps [SATC] officers’ training units, enrollment not only returned to

14 Levine 27, “Organization,” in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 3, Folder 3, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
15 Letter, Clifford D. Walker to Dean C. E. Hewitt, July 30, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 7, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH; Letter, Thomas H. Shanley to Dean C. E. Hewitt, October 8, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 6, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
16 Letter, Dean C. E. Hewitt to Carl S. Greaves, September 11, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 11, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
normal levels, but in many cases surpassed pre-war numbers.\textsuperscript{17} At New Hampshire College, total enrollment by October 1918 was over 1,100 individuals, far surpassing the pre-war enrollment of about 650.\textsuperscript{18} Despite the disruption of normal course structure and the imposition of military command, schools and educators recognized that the camps saved more than 500 educational institutions from being disorganized by the second draft, which was due to take all men of ages 18-20 before June, 1919. Had the training programs not been installed in those institutions, the faculties of the vast majority would have been disbanded by October, 1918, the revenues for the year would have been depleted, and more than half of the institutions would have become insolvent.\textsuperscript{19}

After the Committee on Education and Special Training surveyed educational institutions to determine which had the necessary capacity for vocational training, schools volunteered \textit{en masse}. Although post-war government report claimed that those who were turned down were “greatly disappointed not being able to serve the government,” these institutions’ disappointment was likely influenced by financial as well as patriotic concerns.\textsuperscript{20}

The first vocational detachment arrived at New Hampshire College’s train station on May 16, 1918.\textsuperscript{21} Upon their arrival, each of the 341 men were asked to select their top choice from the following camp sections: “Auto Truck,” “Concrete,” “Carpenters,” “Electricians,” “Blacksmiths,” “Machinists,” “Gas Engine,” “Topography and Drafting,” “Cooks and Bakers.” The student’s first choice, according to the selection form, “should be the subject in which you


\textsuperscript{19} J. H. Wigmore, “The Students’ Army Training Corps,” \textit{Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors} 8, no. 7 (November 1922): 61.

\textsuperscript{20} Dooley 19-21.

\textsuperscript{21} “Distribution of Soldiers,” UA 17/16.
are the best fitted to give the highest efficiency.” Ten days later, Dean Hewitt, the college’s Dean of Engineering and now “Chairman of [the] General Committee and Director of Vocational Training,” wrote to the War Department Committee on Education and Special Training requesting another detachment for the beginning of June. Inspired by the “unusual number of experts” in the first detachment, he requested to have a group of men sent every month, with each group assisting in the training of the next. This move, he explained, would not only decrease costs by eliminating the need for additional paid instructors, but would also increase the amount of hands-on experience given to the students. Dissatisfied with the War Department’s original plan to train students through book lessons, Hewitt made practical training the hallmark of his leadership.

Hewitt’s plan fostered the ideal of the citizen soldier, wherein trainees used their army-developed skills to assist the larger community. The carpentry division built chicken coops for local farmers, the mechanics repaired cars for the town and area residents, while all sections worked together on “campus improvement” projects. These renovations included an annex to Smith Hall, new archways and doors for Thompson Hall, new sidewalks, agricultural buildings, and a firehouse. Considered a great service to the college, these tasks helped build the idea of soldiers as citizens-in-training. In addition to their duties as defenders of the country’s ideals, trade, and sovereignty abroad, they were considered the caretakers of the country’s industry and ideals at home – an image that was strengthened by the fact that the war ended before the majority of these vocational men were posted to overseas duty.

---

22 “Selection Blank,” in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 3, Folder 3, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
23 “Organization,” in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 1, Folder 3, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
24 Letter, Dean C. E. Hewitt to War Department, May 26, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 11, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
It was this plan for hands-on training - specifically through the construction of new campus buildings - that also led to the creation of the camp’s archaeological record. With so many soldiers arriving through Dean Hewitt’s schedule, the carpentry, concrete, and electric sections of the camp worked to build two new barracks, each designed to house 200 men. They were specified at 115 feet long by 44 feet wide and two stories high, built to War Department standards of 45 square feet and 70 cubic feet per man, constructed of spruce framing, and situated on evenly spaced concrete pillars. That June, orders went out from the camp almost daily to J. Herbert Seavey’s hardware shop in Dover, bringing nails, hammers, tools, rope, and other materials to the construction site. Iron pipe, doors, shower parts, and “rubbish burners” arrived from Boston; “Calno board” for interior walls came from Haverhill, Massachusetts; entrance doors were shipped from Newbury, MA; and spruce boards were brought in from several nearby towns. Some of these materials entered the archaeological record during the 1918 construction phase, when workers accidentally dropped or otherwise discarded materials, and during the buildings’ demolition, when fragments were left behind to be plowed into the hill and covered with landscaping. Furthermore, the practice of housing these vocational soldiers in under-construction buildings rather than in fraternity houses allowed everyday trash to accumulate around the buildings, leaving evidence of the soldiers’ leisure activities for future excavation. The officers living in the Alpha Theta Omega house and the soldiers living in

26 Letter, Leon Batchelder to Phil Wilcox, October 30, 1967, in Leon W. Batchelder Letters (UA 22/7), University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
27 Correspondence, C. E. Hewitt to Haverhill Box Board Co., September 11, 1918, and C. E. Hewitt to Committee on Education and Special Training, July 5, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 11, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
28 Order Forms, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 3, Folders 14-17, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
dormitories left no such record; having no equivalent to the barracks’ unfinished crawl space, trash from these buildings would have accumulated in the established disposal systems.\textsuperscript{29}

Other colleges also transformed their campuses physically for their camps. Dean J. W. Votey of the University of Vermont reported to the War Department after the war’s end, “on our own premises, there were erected mess halls, coal bunkers, lumber sheds, a garage for our Signal Corps cars and a laboratory building for radio work.” Students at Vermont also repaired and updated existing buildings, constructed and repaired various buildings at the nearby Fort Ethan Allen, and, like the New Hampshire College camp, “overhauled dozens of private cars” in the automobile section.\textsuperscript{30} In addition to carpentry work, the University of Michigan camp dug a series of model trenches for telegraph and electric wiring practice.\textsuperscript{31} In these cases, the colleges evidently shared Dean Hewitt’s opinion of the value of “manual training.” However, many of the changes to national colleges were less physical and more ideological. Georgia Tech, for example, was already fairly well equipped to have a camp. There, the government program simply redirected the existing Department of Military Science and Tactics, and the 600 vocational men trained at a nearby military camp.\textsuperscript{32} At the University of Illinois, 3,000 vocational men lived in fraternity houses, certainly creating a distinct wartime campus culture, but leaving minimal archaeological evidence of daily soldier life.\textsuperscript{33}

In September 1918, the vocational divisions were absorbed by another joint effort of the War Department and higher education: the Students Army Training Corps [SATC], which accepted high school graduates to take war-themed courses on a trimester schedule. The SATC gave

\textsuperscript{29}“Fraternity Homes Taken Over by Government,” \textit{The New Hampshire} 8, no. 1 (September 26, 1918): 4.

\textsuperscript{30}Dooley 107.

\textsuperscript{31}University of Michigan, \textit{University of Michigan Training Detachment} (Ann Arbor: 1918).

\textsuperscript{32}Richard S. Faulkner, “'Our Patriotic Duty at Home and Abroad': The University of Georgia in the First World War,” \textit{The Georgia Historical Quarterly} 7, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 924 926.

\textsuperscript{33}Levine 27.
participants the opportunity to become officers, which made the program (like the vocational camps) a popular choice among college-aged men. Instead of being drafted to immediate frontline duty as what Dean Hewitt called “an ordinary private,” these men’s deployment would be delayed for their course of study, and they would hopefully obtain higher-ranking positions when they were sent overseas. Under this program, the vocational divisions (which still accepted men with little to no educational background) became the Vocational Division, SATC, while the officers training courses fell under the supervision of the Collegiate Division. With the two programs merged, approximately one thousand soldiers lived on the Durham campus, significantly outnumbering the town’s total non-university population of about 800 individuals.35

The SATC collegiate and vocational divisions operated until December 1918. After the war ended in November, schools were once again thrown into confusion. In their attempts to return to their pre-war status, they struggled to reestablish semesters in a year that had already been divided into trimesters, and to fairly award credit to all students, regardless of whether they had taken the SATC courses.36 At New Hampshire College, private individuals wrote to the school concerned about the cars they had sent to the automobile section for repairs.37 After the War Department’s abrupt withdrawal from campus, the college was caught in a financial battle with the government, attempting to claim reimbursement for materials, food, and training costs. When

---

34 Hewitt to Carl S. Greaves, September 11, 1918.
36 WWI vertical file folder, Milne Special Collections and Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
37 Letter, J. T. Gilman to John L. Welch, September 15, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 11, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
the camp system was dissolved, New Hampshire College was still waiting for over $93,000 in payments.  

In 1919, New Hampshire College acquired the barracks from the War Department, converting them into all-male dorms that were renamed East and West Hall. They were completed in February 1919, and stood until 1971. After demolition, the site was renamed East-West Park, a grassy space now covered in sidewalks. It was on this site that excavations began in the spring of 2012, thirty years after the buildings were removed, and almost one hundred years after the camp turned an intellectual campus into a machine of war and the soldiers into (in the words of University of Illinois’ commanding officer) “cogs in a fighting machine.” Through the combination of archival and archaeological research, the history of the New Hampshire College camp reveals the extent to which vocational soldiers conformed to and participated in creating that standard of discipline – and the degree to which they created and maintained their own community identity.

---

38 Inventories, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 8, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, and Durham, NH.
40 Shearer 216.
III.
Site Overview and Description

The New Hampshire College barracks site was discovered in early 2012, through archival research conducted as part of a University of New Hampshire course (ANTH 444: The Lost Campus). As explained above, similar sites are rare. Other colleges did not necessarily choose to construct new buildings to house their camps, while those campuses that did may have since destroyed those sites with construction or landscaping. One of the few new buildings constructed on New Hampshire College land during the war, the barracks were the best opportunity to study the lives and communities of soldiers and students on this campus.

The barracks stood at the base of “Bonfire Hill,” the naturally sloping land in front of the University of New Hampshire’s Memorial Union Building, west of Quad Way. Although most architectural debris appears to have been removed when East and West Halls were demolished, artifacts and features remained preserved under a layer of landscaping soil that had been deposited during the creation of the East-West Park “green space.” Later, the park was crossed by several sidewalks and ornamented with bushes and trees. Today, Quad Way covers the majority of East Hall’s former location, but, through superimposition of maps and aerial photographs, it was determined that the majority of West Hall’s “footprint” was accessible for excavation.
Prior to excavation, the prospect of finding any significant architectural features or trash deposits seemed highly doubtful. At many World War I college training camps, the only
archaeological signature left might be a scatter midden of items accidentally dropped by students or officers, which would likely be indistinguishable from earlier or later deposits. Unlike military field camps, which might include hearths, temporary shelters, and cooking refuse, college training camps were fairly “clean.” Food was (for the most part) cooked and disposed of in a mess hall, there was no need for temporary shelter or fires, and trash would often be systematically removed. A college camp’s barracks signature might be expected to include foundations (in this case, concrete posts or post holes) and a scatter midden of trash disposed of during activity in the barracks’ “yard.” In the case of the New Hampshire College, the barracks formed a “u” shape, with both buildings connected by a bathroom building, so trash would potentially accumulate in the “courtyard” between the buildings. Given the method by which the buildings were removed, the signature would also be expected to include a scatter of materials such as nails, wood siding, window glass, concrete, flooring, and roofing, which were left behind during debris removal or re-deposited in the ground during post-demolition bulldozing.

Test pits, excavated in March 2012, initially seemed to confirm this scatter-type signature, providing samples of glass, nails, brick, and foundation material, but indicating no concentrations of discarded materials. To recover larger samples of architectural debris and, hopefully, evidence of soldiers’ discard behavior, a total of seven one-by-one meter units were excavated. Six of these were opened in May 2012 as part of a summer research grant funded by the University of New Hampshire Hamel Center for Undergraduate Research. The seventh was excavated with the assistance of students from an undergraduate course in archaeological methods during the Fall 2012 semester. Four units were excavated to sterile soil, and two until further excavation was deemed unsafe for the high-traffic location. These final two (N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003) consisted of a scatter of architectural materials for the first 30cm, but
at further depths revealed a major fill deposit formed during the demolition of the barracks’ sewer lines. These units provided numerous large fragments of sewer pipe, sidewalk tar, and glass. Further excavation would have certainly revealed other architectural materials, as glass fragments were becoming increasingly prevalent in the final levels, but the depth of over 70cm was determined to be unsafe. The final unit, N4979 E4991, was abandoned due to a lack of excavation personnel and the higher artifact concentrations in other units.

The first six units, excavated between May 30 and June 15, 2012, were excavated in 10cm levels. An additional unit, N5001 E5002, was opened in September 2012 to continue investigating a trash pit unexpectedly found in unit N5001 E5003 at lower depths than the initial test pits had reached. This second midden unit was excavated in 5cm levels, so as best to capture the patterns in discard behavior during the brief period of the buildings’ existence.

Excavation yielded various types of architectural materials, including nails, scaffold nails, concrete, a door latch, and sewer pipe. Most of these were not found in significant quantity or in a context that provided useful information. One major discovery was a complete concrete footing from the barracks’ foundation. Most foundation pillars had evidently been removed in demolition, and any postholes had been destroyed during landscaping. However, one small pillar, already partly visible before excavation, was recovered to the rear of the barracks site. Additionally, the two northernmost units, N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003, yielded numerous large fragments of vitrified clay sewer pipe. Since photographs from the barracks’ construction show the sewer lines running between the two buildings, the deposit’s location beneath West Barrack’s footprint suggests that the pipelines were ripped up and covered with fill during demolition. The presence of sewer pipe at depths of 20cm to 70 cm supports this conclusion.
Map 2. Artifact distribution.
While a scatter midden was expected at the site, full-scale excavation revealed a trash pit, sampled in units N5001 E5003 and N5001 E5003, which was highly concentrated and stratigraphically intact. These units, as indicated by superimposition of the unit layout map onto an aerial barracks photo, are located along the “courtyard” edge of West Barrack, suggesting that trash had been routinely discarded under the building’s crawl space (see Map 3). Photographs of
the barracks’ construction show that it was in fact possible for soldiers to walk under the building at its northern end, so the fact that trash accumulated there is hardly surprising.\footnote{Clement Moran, "Barracks, laying sewer, roofing toilet house, June 27, 1918," 1918, in Clement Moran Photography Collection, UNH Digital Archives, www.library.unh.edu/digital/} However, the high fragmentation of glass in the pit, along with low degree of vessel completeness upon reconstruction, suggests that this may have been a more scattered deposit, perhaps consisting partially of remnants of deposits in the “courtyard” that were swept under the building.

Recommendations for Excavations at Similar College Camp Sites

Excavations at this site reflect the unique method of study necessary at college training camp sites. Although camp excavations typically rely heavily on shovel testing, this method did not prove effective at the barracks site.\footnote{Joseph Balicki, “Watch-Fires of a Hundred Circling Camps,” in Clarence Geier et.al, Historical Archaeology of Military Sites: Method and Topic (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2010): 59.} Unlike the relatively unaltered sites of Civil War camps, the degree of fill and landscape soil present at this site made shallow shovel testing superfluous: the shallow test pits did not reach the undisturbed WWI soil layer. They provided a few artifacts from demolition, including nails and glass, but revealed no artifact concentrations. Deeper, closely spaced test pits may have provided a more precise outline of the site, but such methods are unlikely on any central campus site to reveal foundation features indicating exact building locations.

Walk-over surveying, or surface testing, also did not prove to be a useful method in surveying college camp sites. While the excavation’s one foundation pillar was located by walk-over survey, this method did not locate any distinct features, post holes, or depressions marking trash pits. Extensive landscaping had resulted in a thick layer of topsoil that obscured any such
features. Given the significant growth of colleges in the one hundred years since the war, this pattern of re-landscaping and demolition is likely to be replicated at any other college camp site.

This project suggests that the best method of surveying college camp sites is the superimposition of historic photographs on modern maps, using two or more landmarks from both documents as reference points. Although this method was only retroactively used to determine exact correlations between units and the barracks, basic superimposition indicated the general areas likely to contain the barracks’ footprint. Colleges that built similar post-and-frame structures for their camps could use this superimposition method, along with GIS technology, to excavate units directly along the edge of the buildings’ footprints in order to investigate potential trash deposits.
IV. Significant Artifacts

The New Hampshire College barracks sites represents both the consumption patterns of camp facilitators, who made the primary decisions pertaining to construction, and of soldiers, who left evidence of their leisure behavior in the trash pit under West Barrack. However, as the camp was only occupied for seven months before the war’s end, strict method is necessary for distinguishing and analyzing the artifacts related to the war.

In household archaeology – the branch of archaeology that focuses on consumption patterns in residential communities – recognizing frequent changes in consumption and discard behavior is of the strongest importance. In any place of residence, consumption patterns may vary significantly over life phases, including the coming and going of family members, the taking on of boarders, intervals of disease, and seasonal occupational changes. As Charles LeeDecker notes in his study of historic domestic sites, “the dynamic character of the household requires that consumption patterns be examined from a fine-grained temporal perspective, and this requires tight archaeological dating.” The barracks’ 60-year existence requires a particularly “fine-grained” approach, as it entails distinguishing an occupational phase of a mere several months from a total occupation one hundred times that length. The shift from soldier to student occupation should be, to some extent, represented in a trash pit, but the shift from camp to university construction material choices is difficult to see, especially since demolition removed all distinguishable evidence of construction phases.

Among his many suggestions for the interpretation of consumption, LeeDecker provides two methods that are particularly relevant to overcoming these limitations: first, that artifacts should “be understood in the wider context of regional economic development and market conditions,” and secondly, that consumption reflects “values such as frugality and self-indulgence.” Both construction and midden artifacts reflect local and national networks of trade. Construction materials were chosen with regards to wartime rationing as well as to values of quality; and the trash midden certainly reflects soldiers’ tendency toward self-indulgence. This section will briefly analyze significant artifact through this theory, while section 4 will return to these concepts in a broader analysis of the camp as a whole.

*Foundation Pillar*

An entire concrete foundation pillar was upside-down in unit N4979 E4989, at the location of the barracks’ toilet house. Pieces of wood siding with nails intact were found directly beneath the pillar, confirming its connection to the barracks. This pillar was short, measuring 55cm x 42cm x 13cm, and must have been used to support a part of the barracks at the highest point on the hill. The bottom is rough, while the top is a short, smooth rectangle. Based on this example, such pillars were formed by digging a pit (about 50cm x 40cm), placing a mold, and pouring concrete directly into the mold and pit.

This method fits well with Dean Hewitt’s idea that manual training was superior to book learning. Instead of purchasing ready-made pillars or foundation blocks, the students learned to mix Portland cement-based concrete and create pylons. Photographs and order forms indicate that the camp ordered a “Wonder” concrete mixer (and, later, after apparent heavy usage, a replacement handle for such a mixer).
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A concrete pillar, most likely from the rear right of West Barrack, was discovered in unit N4979 E4989 (photo by the author).

Soldiers from the concrete division mixed and poured each foundation pillar as part of their training, using a “Wonder Mixer” specially ordered for the camp. (photo courtesy of UNH Archives, Clement Moran photography collection.)

The soil surrounding the pillar was at first presumed to be fill from the landscaping phase that followed demolition. However, the unit contained only one discernible soil stratum before glacial till, indicating that this was the same soil present on the site in the 1970s; it had simply been plowed across the site to bury all demolition debris. Any topsoil placed above this fill has
either since worn away, or was never placed at all. As the foundation was discovered in a wooded area that, according to photographs, originally abutted the barracks, it would be logical that little or no landscaping fill would have been placed over it.

Since the buildings were constructed quickly to accommodate a new detachment (who actually slept in the unfinished buildings while helping complete them), one might expect that the quality of workmanship would be affected by rushed work. The buildings were intended to be temporary, so it would be logical that perfection would not have been a high priority. In contrast to this assumption, however, this pillar is in fact quite uniform, strong, and durable, containing proportions of coarse aggregate consistent with contemporary trade standards. Coarse aggregate, according to war-era trade journals, was all stone mixed in concrete that would not pass through a ¼ inch sieve. Concrete standards recommended anywhere between a 1:1.5 and 1:3 ratio of concrete to coarse aggregate, with a higher proportion of fine aggregate (usually sand). While it is impossible (within the constraints of this project) to exactly determine the ratio of concrete to coarse aggregate to sand in this pillar, most aggregate is indeed larger than ¼ inch. The average aggregate size in the pillar is ¼ to ½ inch.

Furthermore, concrete foundations were a relatively novel idea. Portland cement was a new material, developed only in the early years of the 20th century, and its potential uses were constantly debated in concrete trade journals. As the Dean of Engineering, Dean Hewitt would have known about these potential new uses, and his choice to use the new material in such a way reflects a willingness to train his students in experimental methods. This method not only provided necessary housing for soldiers, but also allowed trainees to practice specific requirements of their trade.
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**Sewer Pipe**

Units N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003 yielded 131 fragments of vitrified salt-glazed red clay sewer pipe. Most were segments of 12-inch (approximate) diameter pipes, and made of bright red, lightly glazed clay, although one large fragment was from a 6-inch diameter pipe of darker brown, heavily glazed clay. In the lower levels (below 40cm), this pipe was found in higher concentrations and in larger fragments, allowing for the partial reconstruction of several pipe segments.

![Sewer Pipe Fragments](image)

Sewer pipe fragments from units N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003 represent 12-inch diameter and 6-inch diameter vitrified clay pipe. Because they were each hand-fired rather than molded, pipes had to be sealed with cement to prevent leaks. (photographs by the author).

Before and during the war years, the prevalent method of firing clay sewer pipe created segments of inconsistent diameter, making it impossible to produce standardized joints. Segments, consisting of a cylinder with one bell edge, were bonded with cement, resulting in a watertight seal that trade journals boasted could withstand fifteen pounds of pressure per square inch.⁴⁸ The pipe fragments found on the camp site are consistent with this type, having diameters ranging slightly above and below 12 inches, and showing evidence of having been joined with

---

cement. The above photograph of a 6-inch diameter pipe from unit N5008 E5003 retains this high-aggregate cement around the bell edge.

Camp records and order forms do not contain references to the purchase of these pipes, although photographs do exist of the vocational men digging sewer trenches. The type matches that seen in an ad in the college newspaper, *The New Hampshire*, for Akron vitrified clay pipe from Eastern Clay Co. in Boston.\(^{49}\) The camp imported various items from Massachusetts for construction, and it is likely that the pipe arrived from Massachusetts as well.

While it is possible that the camp directors simply had a personal preference for clay over iron, the New Hampshire College camp’s decision to use clay was made during a time of significant government control over construction materials. War-related industries were issued priority licenses over construction material; the college, after sending massive daily orders to J. Herbert Seavey’s company in Dover, received a letter from Mr. Seavey reminding the college to obtain this permit, so as to ensure that Seavey could obtain these materials at any time.\(^ {50}\) As this case illustrates, regulations placed significant stress on businesses and tradesmen. No choice of material could be made without reference to government regulation and war-related availability.

As evidenced in camp order forms and local ads, both iron and clay pipe were available to the camp, easily ordered from Boston and shipped to campus via the Boston & Main railroad.\(^ {51}\) Obviously, factors apart from local preference contributed to the choice. The first of these considerations would likely have been cost. In a scramble to quickly build two new barracks, the college might have resorted to using the cheapest material available. Certainly, clay was less

\(^{49}\) *The New Hampshire* 7, no. 12 (January 12, 1918): 2.

\(^{50}\) Letter, J. Herbert Seavey to Dean Hewitt, July 3, 1918, in Student Army Training Crops Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 11, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.

\(^{51}\) Order form, Braman Dow & Co, Boston, Mass, June 25, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 3, Folder 14, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH; Eastern Clay Co. ad, *The New Hampshire* 7, no. 12 (January 12, 1918): 2.
expensive than iron, and given the intended temporary nature of the camp, longevity of material was not necessarily a concern. However, with the government promising to pay for materials, the camp could reasonably order any materials they wished with no regard to cost.\textsuperscript{52} Indeed, as Dean Hewitt tended to teach the best and proper approaches to the camp’s various vocations, he would have had little interest in cutting cost at the expense of quality.

If cost was not an issue, then, an outside ideological factor may have been involved. Wartime clayworker’s trade journals reveal just such a situation. When the United States entered the war, the government issued a notice that only iron sewer pipe was to be used in military buildings. Clayworkers, fearing heavy profit losses, explained to the War Department that not only was their pipe just as good as iron, but it was also less expensive to produce, making it an efficient choice that saved money for other war needs. Through this defense, it became patriotic to use clay instead of iron. In a notable move of cooperation, the government decided to allow clay pipe.\textsuperscript{53} Since the government technically owned the barracks, these buildings would probably have been required to use iron pipe had this compromise not been reached. The pipe fragments are therefore remnants of a victory of industry over government, in an era when the government consistently repurposed both industry and universities for the war effort. They provide insight into the wartime debates between government and industry, and into the rhetoric of patriotism that shaped not only military behavior, but also personal consumption choices.

\textit{Trash Pit}

A stratigraphic trash pit was discovered in unit N5001 E5003. Plotting the site map over an aerial photograph of the barracks indicated that the pit was directly along the southeast side of

\textsuperscript{52} Inventories, in Students Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16).
\textsuperscript{53} “Federal Housing Code to Permit Clay Pipe,” \textit{Brick and Clay Record} 52, no. 10 (May 21, 1918): 956.
West Barrack, at the point where the pillars were tallest, and, therefore, where it was easiest to walk under the building. A second unit was opened at N5001 E5002 to further investigate the trash pit.

This deposit, which extended beyond the two units in which it was sampled, is in the form of a sheet midden. These types of deposits, also known as a yard or surface middens, accumulate through the occasional scattering of trash on top of a flat yard surface. Unlike planned trash deposits, such as privies specifically created for refuse disposal, sheet middens often consist of non-reconstructable vessels (the larger fragments having been removed for disposal elsewhere). On a modern college campus, as at the University of New Hampshire today, such sheet middens may form when students discard beer bottles, food wrappers, and other refuse on public lawns; the majority of these items are cleared away, but some fragments remain behind to enter the archaeological record, creating a flat, scattered, broad-patterned deposit. Because of this intermittent process of deposition and removal, sheet middens often lack discernible stratigraphy. At the barracks, however, the midden’s location along the edge and under the building prevented and major clearing away of disposed items, resulting in a more concentrated artifact scatter. This process created discernible deposition layers. If a diagnostic artifact from the war era could be found, it would be possible to distinguish the World War I deposition layer from later deposits.

Distinguishing such layers was aided by the barracks’ construction history. At various points in the buildings’ history, the foundation was boarded over, barring entrance to the crawl space and preventing new trash from entering the midden. Trash could have accumulated under the building in two distinct periods: during the construction phase, when the pillar foundation was not boarded over (pre-1919), and when the siding was removed from the pillars, sometime
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around 1960.\textsuperscript{55} Consumption patterns would certainly have changed over these times, in relation to varying levels of military and college supervision, residents’ class status (working-class soldiers versus college students), purchasing power (paid full-time soldiers versus potentially low-income full-time students), and consumer culture. Because of the foundation’s protective siding, however, these changes are much more noticeable than they would have been if trash had accumulated consistently over the decades. A partially reconstructable 1950s or ‘60s Pepsi Bottle, for example, was found directly above an early-20\textsuperscript{th} century “French square” style prescription bottle, with no intermediary artifacts. The presence of modern synthetics at and above the Pepsi bottle’s level clearly demarcates the deposits of 1950s and World War I artifacts.

The medicine bottle found below the Pepsi bottle helped to further confirm the beginning of the World War I deposit. Found in unit N5001 E5002 at a depth of 35cm, the bottle’s base bears a maker’s mark for Whitall Tatum & Co. in a style only used prior to 1920. As the foundation was boarded over by early 1919, prior to any student occupation of the buildings, the bottle could only have been deposited during the training camp era.\textsuperscript{56} Any artifact found in the midden beneath the bottle’s level of 35cm below surface could safely be confirmed to represent the activities of the training camp.

Artifacts dated in this way to the training camp include various bottle glass fragments (beer, champagne, medicine, and soda) and small fragments of 78RPM records. The men who deposited this trash, coming often from a limited educational and working-class background,

\textsuperscript{55}An undated photo from UNH Archives shows the barracks with open foundation; Randall Hall is extant but Devine Hall is not, placing the photo between 1959 and 1966. A second photo, “Barracks, Finished, February, 1919,” shows that all foundation is boarded over by that point. As of a February 1922 photograph, the barracks’ foundation was still covered. However, photographs from 1918 show that a small section of West Barrack was still uncovered. This area corresponds with the excavated trash pit. Clement Moran, “Barracks, Finished, February 1919” and “Tennis Courts and grounds, east of barracks, May 1, 1922,” in Clement Moran Photography Collection, UNH Digital Archives, www.library.unh.edu/digital/; “Showing Barracks A and B,” The New Hampshire 8 no. 9 (November 23, 1918): 1.

\textsuperscript{56}Lockhart et. al, “The Dating Game: Whitall Tatum & Co,” Bottles and Extras 2 (Summer 2006).
were generally not from high-income families, and the money that they earned as soldiers in the camp would in many cases have been sent home to support family members. Given that these men were operating on an extremely limited budget, their trash indicates that two of their most important leisure activities were music and alcohol consumption.

When studying middens, it is important to remember that trash can represent both the activities of residents and non-residents.\textsuperscript{57} Anyone who was present on the site at any time during the camp era could have created trash. At the barracks, for instance, trash under the buildings could represent the behavior of the men responsible for the buildings’ construction, or that of students who congregated in the “courtyard” between the two barracks to socialize. Fortunately for this study, the soldiers at the camp were responsible for the barracks’ construction, confirming that most of the midden’s contents were almost certainly created by the camp’s soldiers, many of whom also resided in the barracks.

The presence of these artifacts outside is notable. A record that broke indoors, along with any bottles whose contents had been consumed inside, would have been discarded in a trash bin and, because of concerns about the Spanish Flu that was ravaging this and almost every other military encampment, removed as far from the building as possible. The pit certainly does not contain all of the trash that the students produced, and the somewhat low degree of vessel completeness suggests that some fragments discarded away from the buildings’ edge were removed for aesthetic reasons.\textsuperscript{58}

While it is easy to imagine that some of the men smoked, drank, and talked together in the courtyard during the summer months, the barracks’ constant state of construction left that area

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid. 348.
\textsuperscript{58} LeeDecker 359.
cluttered with boards and supplies.\textsuperscript{59} This assumption is further complicated by the weather conditions in the fall of 1918, at which time the campus newspaper reported that the area around the barracks was frequently so muddy that men had to “wade through mud to reach their quarters.”\textsuperscript{60} Also according to the campus newspaper, at the same time that work was continuing on the barracks that fall, a boardwalk was installed to mitigate the troubles with mud.\textsuperscript{61} During these muddy times, then, deposition may have occurred primarily during work hours, while in drier seasons trash likely accumulated during both work and leisure activities. Photographs from the camp indicate that supplies were stored under the barracks throughout their construction, providing soldiers with numerous work-time opportunities to enter this space. In the summer, soldiers might actually have preferred to stand under the buildings (West Barrack’s front pillars were easily tall enough to allow for standing room) to escape the sun.

Some of the bottle glass, therefore, may have been deposited during work hours. Photographs do in fact show evidence of on-the-job drinking; the photograph of the concrete mixer in section 2 of this paper features a brandy bottle placed directly in front of the mixer’s wheel. Although it is hardly surprising at first glance that men on a college campus frequently consumed alcohol, it is important to remember that New Hampshire had been a “dry state” since 1917. All sale of alcohol was prohibited, except for medicinal use, chemical study, or for sacramental purposes.\textsuperscript{62} Students were evidently unconcerned by this law, discarding the evidence essentially in the buildings’ “front yard,” where any military officer could easily find it. While trash deposited under a building might seem to be out of sight, much of the trash actually accumulated directly on the edge of the building, and the fact that construction materials were stored under the

\textsuperscript{59} Clement Moran Photography Collection, in UNH Digital Archives, www.library.unh.edu/digital/.
\textsuperscript{60} “The Camp Notes,” TNH vol 8 no 2, p3
\textsuperscript{61} “Camp Notes from All Quarters,” TNH, vol 8 no 3, p3
\textsuperscript{62} Laws of the State of New Hampshire, Chapter 147, Concord NH 1917
barracks meant that anyone could potentially find the alcohol-related refuse. This reveals quite a bit about the leadership at the camp. While a letter from Leon Batchelder, in charge of new buildings in the camp, indicates that a makeshift “prison” was set up for men who skipped work or arrived to work drunk, officers and professors must have been considerably lax in enforcing the law. It is one thing to simply show up to work drunk, in which case a supervisor might assume that drinking took place off campus, and another to leave the evidence of barracks-based drinking in plain view. The prison was likely only for those offenders whose work was seriously impaired by their illegal “beverage use” of alcohol.
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63 Leon W. Batchelder Letters (UA 22/7), in University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
.V.

Analysis

When the War Department created the college training camp system, it institutionalized government control over the higher education needs of the country’s young men. The government needed trained men for its ongoing war, and so replaced the agricultural, engineering, and liberal arts educational systems of national colleges with war aims courses, military engineering, and military French and German. It took young working class-men, determined that most were deficient in their skills, and endeavored to create “experts.” At these new camps, regardless of much any soldier enjoyed his line of vocational work, men ceased to simply pursue their chosen career or educational goals. They no longer volunteered (or paid) to learn their trade or field – the government began to pay them, upon their draft, to learn what skills “the country” needed most. In this framework, an entirely new rhetoric was produced – the rhetoric of national identity. Under these demands for “the nation’s” needs, New Hampshire College rearranged its campus, reorganized courses, and brought in men who would never (under normal circumstances) have attended a university.

No sooner had this new national identity been established at the college, however, than the local community began manipulating the system. The country’s demands for trained, patriotic soldiers did not simply produce those “cogs in a fighting machine” that the University of Illinois idolized; as illustrated by the soldiers’ choices of leisure intoxication, these newly-drafted men refused to give up agency. Dean Hewitt’s commitment to proper training and education likewise illustrates the continuation of old values within the new wartime framework. With these two competing ideas of identity at work, the training camp is best viewed through the theory of imagined versus active communities. Soldiers at the training camp lived with two identities: a
first identity of those idealized standards imposed on and expected of them, and a second formed by the group decisions and actions of their coresident soldiering community.

*Imagined Communities*

The theory of imagined communities, popularized by Benedict Anderson, suggests that the concept of the national community is created through a shared feeling of a “deep, horizontal comradeship.” In order to put the country through a successful war effort, the War Department needed to create this idea of comradeship, popularly known as “100% Americanism.” The entire American population, regardless of ethnicity, religion, age, or citizenship status, had to be imagined as a single, united community, working together with the common goal of winning the war. The camp embodies these ideas through the networks of apparent “cooperation” between the government and schools, between camps and industry, and between soldiers and the local population. Through these networks, the camps participated in several levels of new or imagined communities: the campus residential community, the patriotic American community including every national resident, the collective student soldier community comprised of all college training camps, and, finally the war-determined industrial-educational trade community.

The first of these levels, the localized residential and education community, consisted of the soldiers and officers, all of whom resided on campus. Although the soldiers and officers resided in separate buildings on campus, their shared residence can be analyzed from a household perspective. According to Nancy Solien, the household “implies common residence, economic cooperation, and socialization of children.” By participation in the camp, soldiers, officers, and
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(to some extent) the faculty who often lived near, if not on, campus all participated in the same economic activities. The War Department paid officers and soldiers for their military duties, and reimbursed the college for camp-related expenses. The soldiers and officers acquired most of their food and supplies through the same War Department order process; soldiers (and sometimes officers) ate together in the campus’s gymnasium-turned-mess hall. Finally, while soldiers were not exactly “children” (at “college age,” most would have been in their early 20s), participation in camp courses functioned as a socialization process. The War Aims course, required for all vocational and, later, SATC men, functioned to teach soldiers shared values of wartime fighting spirit, and explained exactly why the Central Powers were to blame for the entire conflict. The camp structure therefore created the idea that all residents were a family, placing the government and officers as parental figures for the soldiers. These new “parents” provided the food and medical needs for their soldier “children,” and, like other parents, instilled their own values in the young men.

By learning these wartime values, soldiers participated in a second, much larger imagined community – the national community. As Benedict Anderson has suggested, “members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” At the New Hampshire College camp, men from New Hampshire and New York who would probably never have otherwise met were required to live and work together. They were part of a much larger network of people who, by virtue of living in the geographic region of the United States, now had new duties associated with their “Americanness.” Across the country, soldiers and civilians alike
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learned what duties were required of them as “Americans” during this war. The word “American” itself indicates that new meaning; through that “image of communion” Anderson wrote of, each resident in the country was known by that single term, and each “American” knew that they, like all the others, had a part to play in the war effort.

Conforming to this identity, or course, required believing that some concept of “Americanness” had always existed, and that the mere coincidence of having been born in the United States, or the fact of one’s immigration to that country, made one an American with associated duties. Anderson notes that such concepts of nationalism are often paradoxical, ignoring “the objective modernity of nations to the historian’s eye” in exchange for the nation’s “subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists.”69 In an era when almost 15% of national residents (including citizens and aliens) were foreign-born, this nationalist identity was certainly new for many.70

Part of the establishment of the “antiquity” of an American identity relied on concepts of a shared history. Nations and “nation-ness,” according to Anderson, are “cultural artefacts” that come into being through the “crossing of discrete historical forces.”71 In many cases, as with World War I, these forces lead to an idealized and ultimately created view of a national history, which can be used to justify the nation’s actions. In the college training camps, all soldiers, regardless of ethnicity or their family’s length of residency in the United States, were required to take a “War Aims” course that taught a specific version of American history. Soldiers whose ancestors had lived in America since the Revolution learned about the democratic importance of the Civil War at the same time as soldiers who had only entered the country within the past

69 Ibid. 5.
71 Ibid. 4
decade. Both groups were taught “topics that... prepare the student to grasp the ideas that make up the sum of our national purpose.”\textsuperscript{72} Whether or not the Civil War had had any bearing on a soldier’s family, that historical event was now “their” history. Furthermore, the War Aims course sought to establish nationhood and the idea of a national community as a permanent feature of American life: according to Dean Woodbridge of Columbia University, “the course affords the opportunity to introduce into our education a liberalizing force which will give to the generations to come a common background of ideas and commonly understood standards of judgment.”\textsuperscript{73} Educators across the country argued that a version of the course should be taught even after the war. Dartmouth created a new Freshman course called “Citizenship” based on the War Aims course, while Columbia University converted the course into “Contemporary Civilization,” a class that would make every student “safe for democracy.”\textsuperscript{74} Like these other colleges, New Hampshire College developed several new Political Science courses after the war, all of which focused on civic duty, nationhood, and America’s place in the world. New Hampshire College’s new “Citizenship” course mirrored Dartmouth’s, described in the 1919 catalog as “a course in civil government and civic responsibility.” A “Civics” course explained the “functions, principles and organization of the American Government; “International Law” focused on “current events and recent developments in world organization;” and “The State,” like the War Aims course before it, was a study of “the development of government from early forms; the government of modern European states.”\textsuperscript{75} These types of courses later developed into Western

\textsuperscript{72} Johnathan Frankel, “The Ivory Boot Camp,” Harvard Magazine (September-October 1991): 73.
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Civilization courses, which are the modern educational method of situating American nation-ness in history.\footnote{Levine 96-97.}

The history taught through the War Aims course was, however, somewhat of a new national fiction. One of course the War Aims course’s designers noted that history was “malleable,” and “can be bent around” current needs. The War Aims circular distributed to all camp schools told course instructors to “emphasize the United States’ reforms in colonial possessions” and overlook the importance of Manifest Destiny in American history. These methods would underscore the required American view that Germany’s expansion policies were ultimately contrary to American actions and beliefs.\footnote{Ibid.} The war effort, according to the circular, “could only benefit from the presentation of truth.”\footnote{Frankel 73.} The official version of history was, however, a complex creation based in the wartime need for cooperation and public support; it may have aided the cause, but when the soldiers were socialized into their national identity, their new knowledge was far from the truth.

Within this community of imagined history, the college training camps functioned as a mini-nation charged with the duty of soldiering. Under the nationalist system, other “Americans” might be expected to buy war bonds, work in war industries, or save food. By doing so they would (in theory) feel that sense of “deep, horizontal comradeship” with their fellow contributors to a successful war effort. Within this framework, college camps emphasized the collective, national importance of educated or skilled soldiers. On October 1, at precisely 12 o’clock, all American college camps were scheduled to hold an initiation ceremony for the Students’ Army Training Corps, which had recently absorbed the vocational camps. At this time, over 140,000 students were to become part of the United States Army, simultaneously pledging their
allegiance to the American government and the war.\textsuperscript{79} The simultaneous initiation emphasized the fact that all college soldiers were a single community, and promoted the idea of a mutual cooperation and purpose. If the ceremony’s structure failed to convince the soldiers to give up their personal strivings in exchange for the needs of their country, the speech given by the New Hampshire College’s President Hetzel sealed the induction’s importance, advising those assembled, “never will you weigh more in the scales of justice and humanity; never again will your allowance of muscle and brawn and brain count so much in the affairs of the world and in the advancement of the human race.” It mattered little that, with the Spanish Flu ravaging many of the camps, the “simultaneous” induction was in fact just as imaginary as the new community: at New Hampshire College, the one thousand vocational and collegiate trainees gathered on Thompson Hall lawn for induction nine days after the scheduled initiation.\textsuperscript{80} The college newspaper, however, reported that all other colleges had been initiated on October 10, rather than on the first day of the month. In addition, as of an October 26 report in \textit{The New Hampshire} from alumnus Clairborne Young, Ohio State University was still under quarantine and had yet to open camp. In the interim, they had unofficially re-titled the Student’s Army Training Corps the “Saturday Afternoon Tea Club.”\textsuperscript{81} On October 10, however, the New Hampshire College initiates were unaware of this situation; as far as they and the camp officers were concerned, the entire army of college soldiers had been activated to their sacred duty in the same moment.

Finally, this residential community of nationally ordained soldiers became part of an imagined cooperative network of trade. Through the training camp, individuals who might never meet except through telegraphs and order forms were expected to cooperate in turning their daily work to war-related purposes. Using the category “war work” as justification for having

\textsuperscript{79} Levine 28.  
\textsuperscript{80} S.A.T.C. Now Recognized Unit,” \textit{The New Hampshire} 8, no. 3 (October 12, 1918): 1.  
\textsuperscript{81} “Newsy Items of the Alumni,” \textit{The New Hampshire} 8, no. 5 (October 26, 1918): 3.
shipments expedited, the camp ordered telephone books from Chicago, welding torches from New York City, and batteries from Philadelphia.\footnote{Order forms, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16).} Across the country, industries did their duty as “Americans” by rushing these orders and giving preference to orders with priority notes from the War Department. Even the choice of certain materials reflects how the camp participated in this cooperative community. By choosing less expensive (but equally efficient) clay sewer pipe over iron, the camp conserved money that could be “better” spent on other aspects of training. Order forms show that the camp also used “Calno board” – a cheap particleboard advertised as an alternative to wooden walls that allowed lumber to be used for war-related construction - for the interior walls of the barracks. By advertising and using these items, both industries and the training camp participated in a culture of semi-voluntary obligation to conserve materials for their nation’s best use. In reality, the camp may have had no choice but to use Calno board, since lumber was already scarce, but the college camp directors (as well as any average farmer building his new project with Calno board) could feel that they were fulfilling their required service to their newly-imagined community.

Additionally, the practice of having colleges train soldiers created a continuum through which these institutions produced not only educated men, but also civic-minded individuals who served their country at home and abroad. They were not only helping the larger, national community through their military training: they also became “civilian soldiers” helping their local community through their vocational skills. As part of their training, students built chicken coops for local farmers and fixed privately owned cars. The farm or car owners had only to pay for materials, and the labor cost would be free. These individuals were helping their national community by assisting in the training of their military, and in return the military helped the home front community by providing vocational service. Soldiers could be seen as more
compassionate than violent: they were model Americans who served their community’s needs at home and abroad. After the war’s end, the campus newspaper remarked on this role with high appreciation: “The Vocational men leave behind them lasting remembrances… A fine example of the skill of some of these men is the unique entrance to Thompson Hall, a bit of architecture that will long grace the college grounds. Surely New Hampshire College will long remember these men with high esteem and deep gratitude.”\textsuperscript{83} The college was not commenting on these men’s skill as soldiers – it was thanking them for their work as civic servants who assisted their country through the beautification of a college campus.

\textit{The Active Community}

Despite their expected participation in these various levels of imagined cooperative communities, industry and educational institutions, however, did not miss the opportunity to turn this new idea of community to their advantage. As has been shown, producers of architectural materials routinely marketed their product as the best choice for serving the country’s needs. The clayworking trades, not wishing to see the iron industry monopolize government business, successfully convinced the War Department to purchase their sewer pipe, thereby profiting from the idea of community service. J. Herbert Seavey, the hardware provider from Dover who insisted that the college get a priority war work note before continuing to ask for supplies he could otherwise never obtain in sufficient quantity, was likely not very disappointed that his stock was constantly selling out. He did, after all, have the highest quality, most colorful stationery paper in any of the camp correspondence, recently updated and designed specifically with uniformed soldiers, and thus was clearly unconcerned with rationing materials like paper for

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{The New Hampshire} 8, no. 8 (December 7, 1918): 2.
He may have acted like he was going along with his patriotic duty, but it was nonetheless a fact that the war was doing wonders for his income.

Dean Hewitt’s plan for hands-on training allowed traditional education to continue in the face of military control. Whereas before the war, Hewitt’s engineering department had hosted a lecture series on new uses of Portland cement (a material created from coal slag and only developed in the early 20th century), the camp now allowed students to work with this new material in the production of sidewalks and the barracks’ foundation. Hewitt was able to order, on government funds, at least one new “Wonder Mixer” for this process, although photographs suggest he ordered two. The quality of the foundation pillar excavated at the barracks site indicates that Hewitt took great pride in teaching these new techniques. It is even possible that some of the Dean’s former students benefited from these opportunities. Based on one report from The New Hampshire newspaper, at least six New Hampshire College men chose to attend the vocational training camp upon their draft selection.

Meanwhile, Professor Eric Huddleston benefited from the camp’s carpentry program. Serving as a Professor of Drawing and the campus architect since 1914, Huddleston became the camp’s supervisor of new building construction. In addition to drafting the blueprints for the barracks, Huddleston supervised their construction. On war funds, he directed vocational soldiers in completing the campus’s new “Commons” building (now Huddleston Hall), the construction of which had formerly been put on hold because of wartime iron rationing. In 1918, no doubt

84 Letter, J. Herbert Seavey to O. V. Henderson, September 24, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 11, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
86 Order form, #5278, Harold L. Bond Co, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 3, Folder 15, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH; Clement Moran, “Barracks, View from Commons, June 21, 1918,” in Clement Moran Photography Collection, UNH Digital Archives, www.library.unh.edu/digital/.
benefiting from his demonstrated expertise as the camp’s architecture instructor, he established a department of architecture on campus, the first college architecture program in New England.\footnote{Organization," in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16); “Delay in Building of New Commons,” \textit{The New Hampshire} 8, no. 3 (October 12, 1918): 1; John Milne, “One Man's Vision,” \textit{UNH Magazine Online} (Winter 2002).} In light of higher education’s former wartime fear of becoming insolvent, both Huddleston’s and Hewitt’s accomplishments illustrate the extent to which colleges were able to turn their patriotic duties to their own institutions’ advancement. Under the illusion of cooperation, education and government interacted along a spectrum of mutual benefit more than in positions of duty and control.

While college faculty manipulated their national duties for education’s benefit, student soldier likewise refused to completely transform into “cogs in a fighting machine.” The combination of archaeological and documentary evidence reveals that this community of dutiful national soldiers was, in many ways, simply an illusion. Soldiers did contribute to the beautification of campuses, and did aid neighbors by repairing cars, but in their leisure time (and on duty) they refused to act as the government’s idea of model citizens. Certainly some were less than excited at having been drafted to “serve” their country. Private Jack White from the New York detachment claimed exemption on his draft card without stating any justification in the required section, and, after the armistice, only about one-quarter of the vocational men stated that they wanted to “make the trip” overseas to fight (according to an article in \textit{The New Hampshire}, “it was taken for granted that the majority wanted to go home as soon as possible.”)\footnote{Draft card, John Anthony White, Bronx, New York, June 5, 1918, in World War I Draft Registration Cards Collection, Ancestry.com; “Camp Notes,” \textit{The New Hampshire} 8, no. 9 (November 23, 1918): 2.} Consumption patterns present in the archaeological record indicate that were not afraid to break rules, and were often more interested in carrying on their pre-war lifestyles than conforming to
discipline. Documentation further confirms that, for all its attempts to create a unified patriotic community, the War Department was not as strong or well organized as it liked to appear.

An investigation of the barracks’ trash pit provides the best evidence for the soldiering community’s actual life. While LeeDecker’s study of household archaeology defines “institutional coresident group such as military garrisons” as distinct from households, as they are not based on kinship, Donald Bender successfully argues that household and family are frequently not synonymous. In such cases, coresidence can certainly imply shared consumption patterns, as occupants generally share some cultural status. In the case of the New Hampshire College camp, barracks residents tended to be working class with no former college experience; all were male; and all were, in the system of national identity, “draft age,” and thus had the same expected obligations. Under these conditions, consumption patterns in the midden can reveal the same information categories as household archaeology. The midden reveals the economic capacities and power structure of the camp, both by what is and what is not represented in the trash.

A very obvious example of artifacts not represented in the trash or on the barracks grounds is bullets. In his study of Civil War campsites, Belicki notes that bullets are incredibly common at residential campsites, having been accidentally dropped during cleaning of guns. While it is obvious that no actual firing practice would have occurred at the barracks, this lack of bullets suggests that the vocational soldiers were never actually issued guns as part of their training. Instead, guns were likely kept elsewhere on campus, to be used only during drill. This reflects the ideology and organization behind this type of camp; while soldiers (usually) were issued uniforms and were expected to follow military discipline, the camp was designed to provide 10-
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week intensive vocational training, so that the men would “be able to meet the immediate needs of the Army.”

While soldiers did practice firing with blanks, as evidenced by a late November “hike” to Newmarket in which soldiers enacted a fight between themselves and Kaiser Wilhelm, the provision of adequate vocational training appears to have been of greater significance. Echoing one young man who wrote to Dean Hewitt, perhaps out of patriotism or perhaps for personal reasons, “I feel that I could best serve my country in this branch with my present knowledge” with his electrical skills, these camps emphasized that being a soldier could imply various duties to one’s country, and they did not all have to involve operating a gun.

The lack of ammunition on campus may also be related to an army-wide problem with obtaining and distributing supplies. At traditional training camps such as Plattsburgh, the draftees parodied the supplies shortage in song and poetry; one Plattsburgh soldier re-wrote “The Wearing of the Green” as “The Simulating of the Green:

> Oh, Major dear, and did you hear the news that's going round?  
> We Cavalry must simulate till horses can be found;  
> We gallop and we single-foot as handsome as can be,  
> But on our own two feet we ride—a horse you'll never see.

The soldiers of the New Hampshire College camp reacted likewise when Co. G’s song leader appeared wearing “a uniform somebody had loaned him;” the soldiers, who had evidently never seen him in uniform in the entire three months he had spent at the camp, poked fun by advertising in the camp newspaper that “he really looked cute.”

In addition to the uniform problem, Dean Hewitt constantly wrote to the War Department trying to ascertain the location of several trucks that had been promised to the automobile section, while the college’s President Hetzel could not understand why, as of October, no officer had arrived to train the Naval

---
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students. Attempting to be polite, while obviously losing patience with the situation, Hetzel wrote to the commandant at the First Naval District in Boston, “It occurs to me that there would be a decided advantage in the training of these men to have them instructed in their tactics by a naval officer. I, therefore, respectfully request that such an officer be detailed to this institution.”96 For all of the War Department’s effort to appear as a unifying force, it was becoming increasingly difficult for soldiers and college professors to feel part of the same community as an agency that could not properly allocate its resources.

Further contradiction of the ideal, orderly American community came in the vocational men’s leisure behavior. A model American soldier would necessarily be expected to follow laws and partake in only morally sound leisure activities, but as we have seen, these soldiers showed no hesitation to break prohibition law, sometimes drinking openly on the job. Either by purchasing alcohol through black markets, or potentially by smuggling it in from Massachusetts on a trip for supplies, the soldiers acquired beer, whiskey, and wine, and deposited the bottles in the trash pit. The presence of higher-class drinks (champagne) along with beer and hard liquor suggests that any alcohol was desirable, although the higher presence of beer and hard liquor bottle fragments is consistent with these men’s working-class status. Although this behavior does not fit well with military discipline, it seems that the vocational men actually expected each other to drink. The “camp notes” section of TNH, which was largely devoted to jokingly shaming fellow trainees, included this stab at Jack White: “Jack White of Co. A isn’t going to speak to us again, he says. He accuses us of accusing him of drinking root beer at Grant’s.”97 Much like any other college hazing, this, along with the other jokes in the column, pressured men to conform to the standards of the group, rather than to the standards of the imagined American wartime

96 Letter, President Hetzel to Commandant, First Naval District, October 21, 1918, in Student Army Training Corps Files (UA 17/16), Box 2, Folder 12, University Archives, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
community. The imagined concepts of nationality had failed to create model citizen soldiers; through coresidence in the barracks, soldiers preserved cultural values of group solidarity and a strong aversion to legal or military control.
.VI. Conclusions and Implications for Further Study

The results of this investigation were limited by several major factors. First, the New Hampshire College training camp operated for only eight months before the war ended, leaving a discard record that, in archaeological terms, was fairly minimal. The use of pre-existing buildings for most of the camp’s functions prevented any major archaeological signature from developing beyond the barracks. Also, this camp, unlike earlier military camps, operated in a time when trash was routinely and systematically removed. The trash that did accumulate in the barrack’s midden is, therefore, representative of a small part of the soldiers’ activities, indicating spontaneous and leisure activity rather than scheduled daily routines. Furthermore, while the barracks remained intact for almost fifty years, the majority of their architectural signature was removed during demolition, and the site’s location on a busy, developing campus has continuously damaged the site’s integrity. The fact that any trace of the barracks remains is remarkable for such an active campus; in April 2013, just six months after the barracks’ excavation was complete, campus repairs on Quad Way damaged the area from which the barracks foundation pillar was recovered. It is only a matter of time before the entire site is developed further.

Restricted to a one-summer budget and several days of in-class excavation by undergraduate students, this project is just the beginning of understanding the ideology and culture of the New Hampshire College training camp. Only two square meters of the West Barrack midden were excavated, although it is likely that the midden extended the full length of the building. Given the thin but broad deposit pattern of scatter middens, larger-scale excavation would reveal a much more detailed portrait of soldier’s leisure life. It is also as yet unknown
whether additional deposits of construction debris, similar to the deposit of sewer pipe, remain at the site. While initial shovel tests proved ineffectual because of the “sterile” appearance of the fill cap layer, more full-coverage, deeper test pits would indicate the presence of any such deposits. Any materials thus recovered have the potential to give additional insight into patterns of local trade and wartime economy.

In the context of such continuing damage, however, analysis of individual artifacts from this small-scale project reveals significant patterns in the imagined wartime community. Focusing on a forgotten aspect of military training, this project reveals War Department influence in fairly remote areas of the country, and indicates that through the war, even rural communities became part of a larger network of cooperation between education, economy, and government.

Additionally, utilizing the archaeological record to supplement historical documentation reveals the ways in which the war affected the average rural vocational man. Instead of looking at the war’s impact on higher-class Americans who likely left numerous paper records of their wartime activities, archaeology tells the story of the war’s influence on daily life across the country. At 500 additional schools, many of which were equally rural, vocational camps, collegiate SATC camps, or both altered the life of the surrounding community. Each of these camps had the potential to leave some type of archaeological record, but as many used pre-existing buildings to house the program, such a record will likely not have survived. Like the University of New Hampshire/ New Hampshire College site, many others will almost certainly have sustained damage from campus construction. It is critical that these sites be studied now, before further damage removes any evidence of this little-known type of camp. Likewise, when universities develop their campuses, they must consider what types of sites they are destroying. Working closely with archaeologists is the only solution to prevent all information from such sites from
being lost forever. In a way that documentation alone cannot, archaeology provides a view of actual life practices of the community of vocational soldiers, who were drafted (willingly or not) to serve a community that, before the war, had not existed.
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