THE ARMY.

A Glance at Its History and Organization.

The Legislative Tinkering Which Has Made It a Military Anomaly.

Logan's New General Supply Bill.

The Cry for Reform and the Coming Struggle in Congress.

LINE AND STAFF.

Suggestions for the American Army of the Future.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 10, 1871.

The appointment of John Coburn, of Indiana, to the chairmanship of the House Military Committee, was in itself a matter of little significance; but when it is remembered that the committee is composed of five Western and the three Southern Representatives, only one place being given to a Northern man, it assumes a new phase. Before the reassembling of Congress it was understood in the best informed circles that this course would be pursued, and it was even asserted that General Logan wanted to succeed Wilson as chairman of the Senate Committee. The latter committee, as it is at present constituted, includes, besides Wilson, its chairman, Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Morton, of Indiana; Ames, of Mississippi; Logan, of Illinois; West, of Louisiana, and Blair, of Missouri. As a matter of course Blair don't count, and Ames and West could not be made to count on any account. All the active Senators on the committee are very busy men. Morton has accepted the place which Sumner refused at the head of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Besides this, Cameron is Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and Morton of Agriculture, and both these Senators serve on both these committees, as well as on the Committee on Military Affairs. Thus Wilson is left to manage his committee pretty much as he pleases, and he has managed it most sadly, for the interests of the country, at least. As chairman of the Military Committee of the House Logan was able to get the ear of the people, but his pyrotechnics only made Wilson and the Senate all the more stolid. Now even his oratorical power may be dissipated. As Wilson's brother Senator and fellow member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs he will be chilled by the cold etiquette which pervades the north wing of the Capitol, and become as powerless and perhaps as stupid as a country school boy in the hands of an old-fashioned pedagogue. No one is better aware of all this than General Logan himself, and hence the efforts of Western and Northwestern Senators for the reorganization of the Military Committee of both houses, which proved only partially successful.

The army, as it is at present organized, is a source of great extravagance, and it is understood that this movement for reorganization was intended to be preliminary to General Logan's hopes of paving his way to the Presidency in 1876 by becoming the

CHAMPION OF MILITARY REFORM.

To this end he will support in the Senate the general supply bill, the main purpose of which will be to consolidate the Quartermaster's, Subsistence and Pay Departments into a single bureau. Quartermaster General Meigs has under him three assistant quartermaster generals, eight deputy quartermaster generals, fifteen quartermasters, thirty-seven assistant quartermasters and twelve military storekeepers. Brigadier General Eaton, Commissary General of Subsistence, has a department composed of four assistant commissary generals of subsistence and twenty-three commissaries of subsistence. Paymaster General Brice, who has just gone on the retired list, rejoiced in two assistant paymaster generals, two deputy paymaster generals and, not counting the lost Major Hodge, fifty-two paymasters. These three venerable officers, whose united terms of service count 155 years, have each a sufficient staff to do the work of all the departments combined, and not fewer than ninety, and perhaps a hundred officers are retained in the army in these departments alone, who do little or no work for their pay. The country will be surprised to learn that it requires fifty-eight officers to pay off forty regiments, besides ninety-four others, to supply our little army. Not only has each of these departments expensive offices in Washington, New York and other cities, but in the capital, at least, they have studiously avoided going into the same building, and though at great expense, they have kept as far apart from each other as possible that they might be more independent. Many of these facts were brought out in General Logan's famous speech last winter, but in a way so rhetorical and at the same time so reckless that the Army bill, which was rushed through the House, failed utterly in the Senate, so far as its important features were concerned, and all that could be saved from the wreck only added to the evils which the law was intended to cure. The expense of maintaining the army has been increased and openings have been made for abuses where no door existed before. This was partly the fault of General Logan and his haphazard attempt at legislation, but Senator Wilson and the Senate were even more to blame.

THE SENATE AND THE ARMY.

The relations of the Senate and the army are very peculiar. These relations can only be understood when it is known that the leaders of the Senate and of our prætorian guards are not only in full accord and alliance, but that both are trammelled by etiquette and both are seeking to make themselves a sort of American aristocracy. It is true Senator Wilson, who has been the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs for so many years, is not much of an aristocrat, but neither is he much of a soldier. No other man could have been so useful in promoting the selfishness of the army, especially of the staff, at the expense of the line and of the country, because no other man could have held his position so long and yet learned so little of the military necessities of the nation. It is a safe assertion, and one that will be assented to by every general officer in the army, that Senator Wilson has acquired just enough of military knowledge to stand in the way of all sensible reform. He is not a supple tool, but he is a convenient instrument, nevertheless. Without sufficient comprehensiveness to grasp a subject which he ought to understand perfectly, he is still sufficiently alive to the mysterious relations which exist between the Senators and the soldiers of the republic to be easily frightened in every emergency, and ready to interpose his inert committee against every proposition for retrenchment and reform. It was thus that the retirement of Logan from the House and the contest he intends making in the Senate demanded a thorough reorganization of both committees if anything of moment is to be accomplished. Much work is to be done and great knowledge of the subject is required from those who are to undertake it if it is to be done in a way that will be acceptable to the country. The people are getting impatient with the army and army legislation, and the pressure ought to have been so strong as to have made the organization of both committees in the interests of reform a necessity. But Logan cannot succeed Wilson as chairman of the Senate Military Committee in any event. The same influences which defeated his Army bill last winter will defeat any such aspirations at any time, either now or hereafter. Wilson suits the Senate and he suits the army also, and when these things are admitted, the whole case, so far as General Logan's aspirations are concerned, is as plain as it is possible to make it.

GENERAL LOGAN.

Despite some rude natural gifts of oratory, and a great deal of obstinate pluck and belligerent activity, General Logan's career has been peculiarly barren of results. He wants higher honors than he has yet attained, and though he sees the Presidency dimly in the distance, he is well aware that neither his military nor his civic achievements are sufficient in themselves to bring him the coveted prize. Burning with resentment against Wilson and the army for the plucking his Army bill was compelled to undergo in the Senate last March, after he had rushed it through the House with so much *éclat*, he was almost willing to turn against the administration, if not to forsake the republican party. A residence of some months at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, and constant association with the "outs" and "soreheads" of New York, very nearly confirmed his malady. His votes in the Senate so far show that he has neither forgotten nor forgiven the foes of his measure and the persons who are regarded above all others as administration Senators. But Wilson and the army are not less the objects of his aversion, and army reform is still his favorite topic of speech and action. His Army bill is his specialty, and it has enabled him to tickle the popular ear and perhaps to pave the way for some necessary reforms. In the grave, gifted and cultivated body to which he now belongs he cannot afford to take a lower place than he occupied in the House, and to lose any part of his dearly prized notoriety would be to lose all chance of attaining to the Presidency. General Logan knows that he does not know everything, but he believes he has a great deal of knowledge concerning army matters. He has been in the camp and the field, as well as in the military councils of the national Legislature. He gained great distinction as a soldier, and he had the courage to decline unusual honors accorded to other officers of the army at the close of the war. And he is not a dullard. Wilson cannot but regard his presence in the Senate Military Committee as a source of danger, and though the Western Senator may be found as gentle as a sucking dove in his new position, it is certain that he will soar very high indeed, unless the Senate discreetly clips his wings. This it is intended to do as the strategic counterpoint to his ambitious designs and levelling propensities. The double-headed aristocracy may be successful; and yet, if General Logan is half as discreet as he is gallant, he will manage to make some ugly thrusts and be able to carry off much popular applause. The waning popularity of Wilson and some military legislation desired by the administration, to which he can consistently put himself in opposition, will make his task all the more easy and may bring him nearer to the realization of his ambitious hopes than even his most sanguine friends anticipate.

THE HYDRA-HEADED MONSTER—WHAT IS NEEDED.

Anything like a full conception of the immensity of the task General Logan has before him can only be formed after a complete survey of that hydra-headed monster, the army, its history, numbers, organization, distribution, duties, uses and abuses. If General Logan had made himself complete master of all these points, and had set them forth with half the fervor he displayed in his celebrated speech in contrasting our forces with the forces of European Powers, only to have his comparisons picked to pieces, he would have put himself in a much more impregnable position. This has never been done in a manner at once accurate, minute and popular, and General Logan's bill fell as far short of being a real panacea for the ills of which he complained as his speech was deficient as a full statement of the grounds of his complaint. Pyrotechnics in oratory will not counterbalance the effect of misstatements of facts; and the want of comprehensiveness in reform, especially in army reform, is generally worse than the ills of an establishment which has grown up with the wants, or apparent wants, of the country. If General Logan intends going no further than the passage of a bill to consolidate the three departments already referred to in this letter, all criticisms as to the necessity and usefulness of which can be at least plausibly controverted, he might as well not attempt any measure at all. What is needed is a complete reorganization upon a system so thorough and so practical that all the machinations and misgivings of the army may be overcome in the satisfaction of the country. This may or may not be what General Logan intends, but it is scarcely to be expected that he has yet matured a plan so unanswerable, so comprehensive and so beneficial as to meet all the requirements of the case.

Such a bill as the General Supply bill, which it is understood General Logan is to champion in the Senate this winter, or one like his Army Reform bill of last year, would only revive the ancient animosities of the line against the staff, and while it might lop away a few officers it is doubtful if, under the existing organization, it can be made of any practical value. A glance at the working of a single section of the law passed last winter illustrates the danger of tinkering at army legislation. General Logan's pay schedule, or whatever else we may choose to call it, is an anomaly which, instead of saving money to the government, has increased the expenses of the War Department in the matter of pay alone nearly two million dollars. The table of pay, subsistence, servants' allowances, &c., allowed by law to the officers of the army previous to the passage of this act was a somewhat complicated document and it is given here in a form as much simplified as possible. It must be understood that all these figures apply to officers on duty, as in the cases of major and brigadier generals not commanding divisions or departments the allowances were not quite as large. The following is the table under the old system of the

PAY OF THE ARMY.

Rank or Grade.	Officer for Self. Pay.	Officer for Self. Subsistence.	For Servants. Pay.	For Servants. Clothing.	For Servants. Subsistence.	Total.	
	Pay. Papers.	Commutation 30 cent per ration, month of 30 days.	Commutation at $16.	Commutation 30 cents per ration, month of 30 days.		Compensation for month of 30 days.	Compensation for month of 31 day.
General	$400	720	64	26	36	1,296	1,331
Lt. General	270	720	64	26	36	1,166	1,191
Major General	220	270	64	26	36	616	626
Brigadier General	124	216	48	19	27	434	442
Colonel	110	54	32	13	18	227	229
Lt. Colonel	95	45	32	13	18	203	205
Major	80	36	32	13	18	179	180
Surgeon, 10 years' service	80	72	32	13	18	215	218
Asst. Surgeon, 10 years' service	70	72	16	6	9	173	176
Captain, mounted	70	36	16	6	9	137	139
Captain, not mounted	60	36	16	6	9	127	129
Adjutant	63	36	16	6	9	130	132
Quarterm'er	63	36	16	6	9	130	132
Commissary	63	36	16	6	9	130	132
1st Lieut., mounted	53	36	16	6	9	120	122
1st Lieut., not mounted	50	36	16	6	9	117	119
2d Lieut., mounted	53	36	16	6	9	120	122
2d Lieut., not mounted	45	36	16	6	9	112	114
Chaplain	100	18	—	—	—	118	118

According to the new law the following is the schedule of the

PAY OF OFFICERS IN ACTIVE SERVICE:—

Grade.	Yearly Pay.	Monthly Pay. Prior to 5 years' serv'ce.	5 years' serv'ce.	10 years' serv'ce.	15 years' serv'ce.	20 years' serv'ce.
			10 p.c.	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
General	$13,500	1,125	—	—	—	—
Lieut. General	11,000	916	—	—	—	—
Major General	7,500	625	—	—	—	—
Brigadier General	5,500	458	—	—	—	—
Colonel	3,500	291	320	350	375	375
Lieutenant Colonel	3,000	250	275	300	325	333
Major	2,500	208	229	250	270	291
Captain, mounted	2,000	166	183	200	216	233
Do., not mounted	1,800	150	165	180	195	210
Regimental Adj't	1,800	150	165	180	195	210
Do. Quarterm'er	1,800	150	165	180	195	210
1st Lieut., mounted	1,600	133	146	160	173	186
Do., not mounted	1,500	125	137	150	162	175
2d Lieut., mounted	1,500	125	137	150	162	175
2d do., not mounted	1,400	116	128	140	151	163
Chaplain	1,500	125	137	150	162	175

This system was found anomalous in this respect, that the pay of a brigadier, who had been many years in the service, might exceed that of a major general whose services could not be estimated by the same length of years, and so down through every gradation of rank. And this was provided against by another anomaly—namely, that the whole yearly pay should not exceed certain fixed sums, and the ten, twenty, thirty or forty per cent was only allowed to officers under the rank of brigadier. But this was not all. General Logan designed this increased yearly pay in lieu of all commutations, and the law so declares; but it also contains a proviso that fuel, quarters and forage, in kind, may be furnished to officers by the Quartermaster's Department, as before allowed by law and regulations. Thus, officers in Washington and other cities get not only the increased pay, but hired houses, with a bountiful supply of coal and improved grates in which to burn it and many conveniences they could not have obtained under the old system. This is only a specimen of the legislation which has come from General Logan's efforts, and yet it is impossible to look at that wonderful institution, the army, without seeing the necessity of wise enactments on every hand.

A GLANCE AT THE GROWTH OF THE ARMY.

After the close of the Revolutionary War the United States were for a time without a military force. The Continental army was disbanded as soon as hostilities ceased, and the stern republicans of that day were inveterate in their hatred of a military establishment. But the protection of the frontiers from hostile Indians and the necessity of keeping intruders off the public lands till they could be legally opened and sold soon compelled the employment of soldiers. Three years after the ratification of peace Congress proceeded, with great deliberation and caution, to take small bodies of State troops into the federal service, the resolution for raising them carefully stating the purposes for which they were to be employed. They were distributed and governed by the federal Secretary of War, and the federal Treasury made the necessary provision for their support. So few men were employed, however, that when Congress, at its first session after the adoption of the new constitution, recognized the then existing establishment as the Army of the United States, it consisted of only one small regiment of infantry and a battalion of artillery. This little army of 1,000 men, rank and file, accepted and continued by our first Constitutional Congress in 1789, had grown in round numbers to 5,000 seven years later. The *émeute* with France in 1798 carried it forward to 25,000, but the settlement of that difficulty was followed by its reduction to less than 3,000. This force being too small for the necessities of the republic it was again gradually increased till in 1808 the army once more numbered 10,000 men. On the outbreak of the war of 1812 nearly 25,000 men were under arms, and an additional 20,000 were authorized during the first year of the war. In 1815 peace brought with it a reduction of the force to the limit of the army in 1808. A further reduction to a standard of 6,000 men was made in 1821, and even in the war with Mexico the regular army never exceeded 15,000 men. From the close of the Mexican war—uniformly successful, on the authority of General Scott, through the skill of the West Point graduates—to the beginning of the rebellion an average force of 10,000 men was in the service. In 1861 the regular army was increased to 35,000 men—a number which carried it through the war, but was insufficient by 22,000 for the eventualities of peace in the eyes of Senator Wilson and General Schenck, chairmen of the Military Committees of Congress. These men had both played soldier, and they could appeal to the country, saying, "We know how it is ourselves." The actual as well as lawful strength of the army is now 30,000, but it is organized on a scale of 55,000, the three arms of the service counting forty regiments, of which there are ten of cavalry, five of artillery and twenty-five of infantry. The staff and line are composed of 2,250 commissioned officers of all grades, and there is any quantity of lumbering machinery as the result of legislative tinkering.

THE CURRENT OF ARMY LEGISLATION.

Hostility to a standing army has actuated American statesmen from the beginning of the republic. Immediate legislative supervision and authority were constantly exercised. But this hostility was not always well directed, and the legislation has sometimes flowed in the directly opposite channel. From the First Congress to the Forty-first there has been an unceasing but irregular current of military law-making upon the traditional *bête noire* of free institutions; but while no single officer or soldier has ever been commissioned or enlisted without direct authority of law the enactments are too many and too complex to admit of a detailed review of the history of our military establishment. Generally speaking it has been augmented and favored whenever danger threatened at home or abroad and reduced and neglected when the outlook was tranquil. Compromises have not been rare between the necessity of returning to a peace footing and a reluctance to strip officers of the rank conferred or won in times of apprehension and war. From first to last great delicacy has been shown in dealing with the army tenure of office, and the only severe strain upon the principle was General Logan's recent reduction of the burdensome peace establishment foisted on the country by Wilson and Schenck in 1866, a full year after hostilities had ceased. This departure from one of the soundest maxims of army management would not have happened if the combined wisdom of these military legislators had given us a provisional force for immediate duty in the Southern States and otherwise refrained from touching the army with their unskilful hands. But Schenck was ready to go even further, as is evident from his endeavor to enact into permanence the name and functions of the Provost Marshal General—an office as necessary in its day and as odious as was that of the public hangman in the olden time. The temper of Congress, goaded by the press, would not brook the presence of this ghoul of war in time of peace, and it was remanded to the tomb on thirty days' notice. These Congressional generals rode their hobbies with something like the skill of John Gilpin when he took that famous ride, and the statutes at large for 1866 are full of the ridiculosities, as Mr. Sumner would say, of these military bulls in the Congressional china shop. It is useless, however, to bewail the condition in which the legislation of Congress has left the army, and so we may as well contemplate it as we find it.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ENLISTED MEN.

The force of 30,000 enlisted men is made up of a small battalion of engineer troops, about twenty small ordnance detachments, employed as artisans and laborers at arsenals; permanent parties at the general recruiting depots; cavalry and artillery detachments at West Point; 150 clerks and messengers at department and division headquarters; about three hundred clerks, messengers and orderlies in the bureaus at Washington; twenty ordnance sergeants and 150 hospital stewards at military posts; the band at the Military Academy; the signal service and weather report detachment; an average of 1,500 recruits *in transitu* or awaiting instruction, equipment or assignment at the recruiting stations and about twenty-seven thousand men distributed mostly in the South and among the hostile Indians. This force is admitted to be too small by at least 5,000 men for the service expected from it; but it is officered, apparently, far beyond the requirements of so small an army, and at least fully up to its necessities.

GENERAL OFFICERS—THE LINE AND STAFF.

As before remarked, the army of the United States comprises about two thousand two hundred and fifty commissioned officers. Of these there are thirteen general officers, eight professors of the Military Academy, eight chiefs of staff departments who are also heads of bureaus of the War Department, eighteen assistant adjutant generals, nine inspectors and assistant inspector generals, nine judge advocates, eighty-four quartermasters, twenty-eight commissaries, 220 medical officers, sixty-four paymasters, 112 engineers, seventy-six ordnance officers, one signal officer, thirty post chaplains, 432 cavalry officers, 280 artillery officers and 877 infantry officers. Of the regimental officers thirty-four are permanently serving as aides-de-camp to generals, with increased rank and pay; about twenty-five are constantly employed as instructors at the Military Academy; a small and varying number are usually on signal duty; and probably not more than twenty are on temporary detached service of other kinds, including, of course, Second Lieutenant F. D. Grant, who was recently ordered to Europe to take care of the General of the Army. The commissioned officers exclusive of the generals are distinguished as line and staff officers. The proportion of the latter to the former is about two-fifths—a proportion which has led to much unfriendly criticism in Congress, in the line and through the press. But before the force of these criticisms, which were the chief burden of General Logan's rhetorical speech last winter, and which will be revived again on the introduction into Congress of his General Supply bill, can be definitely determined it will be necessary to take a comprehensive view of the whole subject of staff service.

THE GROWTH OF THE STAFF.

The career of the staff has been a tortuous one. Its germ, which was transplanted from Europe during the Revolution, took root in the *quasi* war with France and sprouted vigorously in the actual war with England. The present adjutant general, inspector general, quartermaster general, paymaster general and surgeon general go back for their originals to 1798, and the judge advocate to 1799. The chief of engineers dates from 1802 and the chief of ordnance in ten years his junior, but has found life to go harder with him. The commissary general of subsistence in his modern form came to the surface in the general reorganization of 1821, but the present aged and respectable incumbent of that office, General Eaton, to all appearances, had ceased to be modern before that time. His duties, as well as those of the chief of ordnance in part, were previously discharged first by an officer of the Treasury known as the purveyor general of supplies, and afterward by an army official called the commissary general of purchases. All of these places are now filled by brigadier generals, who are flippantly called writing generals and generals of pork and beans by the irreverent officers of the line.

The medical and hospital staff was established in 1799, the corps of engineers in 1802, the quartermaster's department in 1812 and the pay department, to replace the regimental paymasters, in 1821. The ordnance department, first established in 1812, was merged into the artillery in 1821, but was re-established ten years afterward. The artillery are now moving for another consolidation and the ordnance men are in arms against it, both the attack and the defence being very spirited. What is chiefly wanted, if we may judge from the experience of the late war, is a consolidation of the ordnance corps of the army and navy, though the great experience of Senator Wilson in the field and of Secretary Robeson on the water has as yet failed to suggest it. This consolidation would promote simplicity and uniformity, and would prevent the ordnance service of the government from competing with itself for the products of the mines and the foundries, as was the case during the war for the Union.

The adjutant, inspector, quartermaster and commissary generals originally got their assistants by temporary detail from the line, the detached officers receiving a slight increase of pay. This had a spurring effect on the young infantry or foot artillery lieutenant anxious to get on horseback and to stay there as long as he could; but the civilian and the liner now enter the staff through the common door of influence, and both regard the possibility of future service in the line with disgust, if not with indifference. Up to 1861 the assistants in the Adjutant General's Department were lieutenants taken from company service and invested with the brevet rank of captain while on staff duty. In September of that year Congress, without affording a chance for a new deal, turned all these youngsters into full blown majors, so that when their former captains on the frontier came into Washington, as they were soon compelled to do by the exigencies of the service, they found the boys had outstripped them in rank, and they, not their late "subs," were compelled to do the saluting. That they did it without external flinching is a noble tribute to the supremacy of Congress and true soldierly discipline. The further history of the staff is more or less of a piece with this incident in the record of the so called writing generals; for not only are their chiefs brigadiers of pen and ink, or pork and beans, but they, too, have since been brevetted to the rank of generals. It must not be forgotten, however, that the staff did excellent service during the war, and that the line officers get exclusive credit in battle reports and war correspondence, though it is to be feared the staff people will never give over bewailing their missing the opportunity of being killed in action.

STAFF AND ARMY NOMENCLATURE.

The nomenclature of the staff is one of those minor subjects not wholly unworthy the genius of General Logan. The adjutant general is one and the quartermaster general is one, but the inspector general is four; so that the superior rank and authority of the title in the first two instances cannot apply to the last named officers. It is equally difficult to determine the rank and authority of the title of assistant in all these departments, as will be apparent from the following table, the figures indicating the date of the respective commissions being the only guide:—

Name, rank and date of commission.	Name, rank and date of commission.	Name, rank and date of commission.
ADJ. GENERAL.	INSP. GENERALS.	Q. M. GENERAL.
Brigadier Generals.	*Colonels.*	*Brigadier Generals.*
Townsend, Ed'd D., Feb. 22, '62.	Marcy, Randolph B., Aug. 9, '61.	Meigs, Montgomery C., May 15, '61.
Assistant Adjutant Generals.	Sacket, Delos B., Oct. 1, '61.	*Assistant Quartermaster Generals.*
Colonel.	Schriver, Edmund, March 13, '63.	*Colonels.*
Drum, Richard C., Feb. 22, '59.	Hardie, James A., March 24, '62.	Allen, Robert, July 28, '66.
Lieut. Colonels.	*Assistant Inspector Generals.*	Rucker, Daniel H., July 28, '66.
Fry, James B., Dec. 31, '62.	*Lieutenant Colonel.*	Ingalls, Rufus, July 29, '66.
Kelton, John C., March 23, '66.	Davis, Nelson H., June 13, '67.	*Department Quartermaster Generals.*
Williams, Robert, Feb. 22, '59.	Jones, Roger, June 13, '67.	*Lieutenant Colonels.*
Majors.	*Majors.*	Easton, Langdon C., July 29, '66.
Whipple, Wm. D., July 17, '62.	Baird, Absalom, Nov. 13, '61.	Van Vliet, Stewart, July 29, '66.
McKeever, Chauncey, July 17, '62.	Ludington, Elisha H., April 20, '64.	McFarran, John C., July 29, '66.
Ruggles, Geo. D., July 17, '62.		Holabird, Samuel B., July 29, '66.
Vincent, Thos. M., July 17, '62.		Tyler, Robert O., July 29, '66.
Greene, Oliver D., July 17, '62.		Tompkins, Chas. H., July 29, '66.
Breck, Samuel, July 17, '62.		Ekin, James A., July 29, '66.
Pelouze, Louis H., March 24, '64.		Myers, Frederick, March 6, '67.
Wood, Henry C., June 24, '64.		
Taylor, Joseph H., March 30, '66.		
Martin, James P., April 10, '69.		

This table is rich in anomalies. Thirteen officers bear the title of assistants to the Adjutant General, but all of them except two or three find their only usefulness in acting as executive officers for the generals commanding the military divisions and departments and would be better designated as division and department adjutants, or even as chiefs of staff. In the Inspector General's Department one of four so-called inspector generals is the nominal head of the corps, the other "generals" are, as a matter of fact, division inspectors, and the "assistants" the bosses of the inspection business in the geographical departments. The Judge Advocate General has one assistant whose help has never yet been required by his chief, and he has found various employments either as a Judge Advocate or upon such duties as any military officer of moderate legal acquirements can usefully perform. Four titular assistants are provided for the Commissary General, of whom three are upon commissary duty in the army, only one finding employment consistent with his official designation. One assistant surgeon general is named in the Statutes at Large and on the Army Register, and those who do business with the Medical Bureau, will find him on the precise kind of duty that his title implies. There is a large number of assistant surgeons described as such, who, with lower military rank and less pay, are as much surgeons in effect as their seniors, who bear that full designation. Of assistant paymaster generals there are four, according to law, but the Paymaster General, wisely enough no doubt, keeps them all away from bureau duty at Washington, and uses them as simple paymasters for the troops. The corps of Engineers and the Ordnance corps are governed by chiefs, officially known and described as such, who draw such professional assistance as they need in their bureaus from officers of the corps, irrespective of rank, title or date of commission. The Assistant Quartermaster General was once, in fact, the assistant of his chief, but he is now three, of whom but one fills up the measure of his title, the other two being a division and a depot quartermaster respectively. The Deputy Quartermaster General was the occasional substitute of the head of his department before the assistant proper came into being, but he, too, has grown into eight, of whom not one is available for his nominal duties, all, happily, being absent from Washington and better employed as depot and department quartermasters. There are quartermasters and assistant quartermasters; but one of the former is the quartermaster of a two-company post, while one of the latter is in charge of one of the four great depots of the army. The others of both grades are as variously employed as their seniors, and usefully in the main, as the little world of the army goes. This want of analogy between descriptive title and actual duty extends through all the staff, except the Engineer and Ordnance departments, and its general mystification and inconvenience is undeniable; while to some extent it is unnecessarily costly, especially in the item of printing. Any suggestion of improvement appears to be inseparable from ideas of deeper-seated reform; but a brief proposition may be advanced that none but the chief of a department should receive any permanent prefix or addenda to the substantial title; and that the subordinates of all grades should be distinguished in the army list by the rank obtained through regular promotion or length of service, aided in actual duty by changeable designations indicative of their successive employments. Thus in the Quartermaster's Department there would be colonels and depot quartermasters, lieutenant colonels and division quartermasters, majors and district quartermasters, captains and post quartermasters, and so on. Those on bureau or other special duty could be known as quartermasters, with their army rank prefixed. This would be a long step towards the goal Simplicity, and none would suffer in dignity or purse from its being taken. Another and a longer step would be the abolition of the useless and too often ridiculous army rank of what is known as the non-combatant staff—that is to say, the lawyers, the commissaries, the doctors, the paymasters, the parsons and the storekeepers. The apparition at a military post of a brevet brigadier general's uniform, epaulettes and sash, with a case of surgical instruments under its arm, a tiny staff sword by its side, a pair of spectacles on its nose and a blue cotton umbrella over its head, is not at all uncommon. The equity of assimilated pay, allowances and tenure of office, with personal precedence by length of service, is not denied but the impropriety and inconvenience of combatant rank is tacitly admitted by the War Department itself in its frequent official omission of the honorary in favor of the actual title of these useful but unmartial public servants. The proposition is believed to be incontrovertible that a commissary could, as such, purchase in the marts of trade the alloted modica of soap, rice, beans, coffee, beef, pickled pork, sewing silk and canned oysters, and issue or sell the same to the troops, officers' families and laundresses, and receive a fitting compensation for his labor and length of service as efficiently and respectably as if he were a major by rank and a brigadier general by brevet—titles suggestive more of marching orders and bulletins of war than of prices current and ration returns. And if the argument needs further support, it is found in this instance, in the act of Congress abolishing the army sutler and imposing his whole business, minus the extortions and profits, upon the commissary.

Thus it will be seen that in the mere designations of the staff there is the same incongruity that exists all through the service, and these varying titles applied to identity of service are lesser and partial evidences of the evils of that patchwork legislation that has built up the staff from nothingness to magnitude, while leaving it destitute of even the outward semblance of uniformity of design. Our legislators have borrowed or accepted the cumbrous nomenclature of foreign establishments, but the conditions of our service have divorced function from name in the transfer, and burdened us with a legacy of high-sounding but empty titles.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE STAFF—THE PROPER UNIT OF ORGANIZATION.

The opponents of this undeniably large staff frame all their exhibits of its extravagance on the number of enlisted men and regimental organizations; the defenders ignore such a basis and point to the number of divisions, departments and military posts and extent of territory covered as the true factors of the calculation. Both disputants are partly right and partly wrong. Regimental organization has no relation to the duties of our army in times of peace, and under no circumstances probable in our day is a single regiment likely to possess the opportunity of making its own acquaintance. Here and there, at a post like Fort Russell, in Wyoming Territory, a force equal to the strength of a regiment is sometimes called in to winter, but it is a mongrel horde, representing all arms and many designating numbers. The company is the proper unit of organization for us, with a major, say, for every four companies; a lieutenant colonel for every eight companies, and a colonel for every sixteen, or from that to twenty companies. This would give the proper number of officers of suitable rank for the command of of the larger posts and the inferior Territorial divisions, and would bring the troops, their stations, their administrative system and their duties into harmony, and no deceptive tabulations of facts and figures could then impose upon the heedless and the ignorant who have to deal with military questions. Senator Logan may find in this suggestion something worthy of his attention.

On the other hand, the necessity of employing the major and brigadier generals, eleven in number, at something, undoubtedly prolongs the existence of superfluous military divisions and departments, as, for instance, the military division of the Atlantic, commanded by General Meade, with headquarters at Philadelphia, and the Department of the Lakes, commanded by General Cooke, with headquarters at Detroit, and comprising in its limits but four military posts, garrisoned habitually by some regiment recuperating from a three years' tour of duty in the South. The general tenor of the retrenchive orders from Washington of the past two years clearly fastens upon these, if not other departments, the character of "necessary evils," but executive retrenchment cannot materially curtail the retinue of aides, adjutants, quartermasters, commissaries and other gentlemen of the staff corps, and these, however little they may have to do, besides keeping their commander company, require offices, clerks, messengers, furniture, stationery, fuel, &c., and must be provided with suitable hired quarters in the cities where headquarters are located, with heating and cooking apparatus, coal, wood and kindling material, with medical attendance, stables, forage and commissary establishments. Nor is this all; for as all papers and correspondence that might otherwise go direct to their proper destination must now go out of their way to pass under these fifth wheels of the government ambulance, the public business is delayed and those revolving curses of the American Army, red tape, routine and 'ritin', are given unrivalled license. This latter evil the War Department, less than a year ago, attempted to check by a regulation, conservative, yet effectual as far as it went; but the pilots of the ancient "intermediate channels," suspecting this regulation to be but the precursor of another to come revoking their licenses altogether, took courage from despair and disregarded it altogether.

ARMY OFFICERS ON DUTY IN WASHINGTON.

There are some fifty-five army officers on duty in the city of Washington, of whom eight, at an average cost of about $8,000 per annum each, including salary and all allowances, are engaged upon duties that, without injustice to either class, may be assimilated to those of the heads of bureaus in the Treasury and other departments who receive a total salary of from $3,000 to $4,000 each, with no allowances whatever. The rest receive or enjoy salaries and allowances ranging from $6,500 to $2,800—the average being, perhaps, $4,500 each—with duties assimilative in most cases to chiefs of divisions in the civil executive departments at $2,200 and $2,000 each, some, however, falling below that standard of important usefulness, and others, again, performing service that lies above the reach of the computation tables. For some portion of any extravagance apparent in these figures General Logan is himself responsible, as that part of his economical reform bill that passed both houses of Congress and became law largely increased the total emoluments of the lower grades and reduced none but those of the present General and Lieutenant General, whose past value to the country being beyond its future ability to recompense and reward in filthy lucre, were, on some principle of logic by inversion, subjected to a reduction of a few thousands apiece.

THE STAFF ON A DESCENDING SCALE.

The staff, in all its branches, is now on a descending scale. The sixth section of the act of March 3, 1869, provides that, until otherwise directed by law, there shall be no promotions and no new appointments in any staff corps of the army. This act was wise in that it provided for a reduction of the staff at the same time that it reduced the line of the army to but little more than half its existing size; it was liberal in that it deprived no staff officer of his office, nor reduced him in grade, but it was partial in that it sheltered the staff officer from that honorable, but unmerited discharge, which it had but just ordered for the regimental officer whose regiment or company had been broken up by consolidation. But one wrong does not justify another, and section 6 might well pass uncriticised if there were any reasonable hope that its liberality would be recognized and the justice and propriety of its intention and cheerful acquiescence. There is no such prospect, however, for already the campaign of last winter gives signs of re-enactment and every "in" that hopes for higher rank and pay, and every "out" that hopes to become an "in" if the flowery path be reopened, is under arms and prepared to advance on the Capitol. The chiefs of the staff corps, too, are doing their part earnestly by representation of the injury the public service is enduring through the continuance of these "vacancies," as they are careful to designate them. With one corps, however—the engineers—this cry is no shallow pretence, as its duties are related, not to the size of the army, but to the real and expected growth of the country and its commerce, and its officers are actually overworked. Congress, therefore, will have to face the necessity of repealing its restrictive law so far as it concerns the corps of engineers, or overhaul its system of internal improvement, and consider whether it will not defer the embellishment of some of the rivers and harbors that appear in no recorded history but that of appropriation bills until the commerce that is supposed to be demanding admittance shall give some outward sign of its presence. But as we can scarcely expect that so valuable an electioneering agency will be abandoned, let us trust that posterity, for which we are in so many ways laboring and spending with true paternal solicitude and self-denial, may reap a harvest from our efforts. As for the other staff corps, it is a wise and friendly counselling that bids them to be silent. Congress will not touch the subject of the staff at all without further curtailing it, and that politician is *sui generis* who, on the eve of a Presidential campaign, in a time of profound peace, with an unending vista of peace before him, would propose to the popular branch of Congress an increase of the more ornamental part of the army.

It would scarcely be believed, if the assertion was made, that if the President should assign the second lieutenants now in the service to duty in the same regiment according to their brevet rank, there would be officers enough to fill all the places, with the exception of colonel, to which place a brigadier general of volunteers by brevet could be appointed, and some brevet majors and captains even then would be compelled to content themselves with lower grades. And yet here is a forcible roster of

A REGIMENT OF SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Colonel—George M. Love, Second Lieutenant Sixteenth Infantry, Lieutenant Colonel by brevet, Brigadier General volunteers.

Lieutenant Colonel—Edward L. Bailey, Second Lieutenant Fourth Infantry, Lieutenant Colonel by brevet.

Major—Allen H. Jackson, Second Lieutenant Seventh Infantry, Major by brevet and Colonel of volunteers.

Captains.

Cyrus A. Earnest, Second Lieutenant Eighth Infantry, Major by brevet and Lieutenant Colonel volunteers by brevet.

Edwin B. Atwood, Second Lieutenant Sixth Infantry, Major by brevet and Major volunteers by brevet, March 2, 1867.

M. F. Gallagher, Second Lieutenant Second Infantry, May 11, 1866, and Colonel volunteers by brevet, March 2, 1867.

Sidney E. Clark, Second Lieutenant Second Infantry, July 28, 1866, and Major volunteers, March 2, 1867.

M. C. Wilkinson, Second Lieutenant Third Infantry, July 28, 1866, and Captain volunteers, March 2, 1867.

Andrew C. Bayne, Second Lieutenant Sixth Infantry, July 28, 1866, and