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Abstract During World War I, the U.S. War Department contracted with 157 universities to form the National Army Training Detachments whose mission was to train college-age draftees in 66 critical army trades (subsequently the Student Army Training Corps). This program is an overlooked part of First World War history and has received little to no archaeological inquiry. This paper investigates the New Hampshire College camp. Working between documentary and archaeological materials, this paper explores how the interrelated duties of educational institutions, businesses, government, and individuals merged with an American wartime imagined community here but also how in their lived experiences of the camp, people materialized the complications of balancing citizenship, difference, duty, and nation. The social lives of the lower-rank men who inhabited these camps, the composite communities formed at them, and the impact of the government’s assertion of control over institutions of higher education all carry material ramifications that deserve further investigation.
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Introduction

Facing a severe shortage of vocational experts in World War I, the US War Department 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 (this subsequently became the Student Army Training Corps [SATC]). 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 (Dooley 1919, p. 3). New Hampshire College, a land-grant agricultural college in the small town of Durham, NH, was one of these institutions of higher education transformed into a vocational army training camp (Fig. 1). New Hampshire College became the University of New Hampshire in 1923.

The first detachment arrived at New Hampshire College on May 16, 1918. The campus, and, by extension, the surrounding town, quickly became “occupied” by the...
army: the college newspaper came under government control, the War Department introduced new war-themed courses, and the army dominated local businesses with priority order forms. The first 341 New Hampshire men who arrived that May day trained as mechanics, truck drivers, carpenters, and electricians, while a small number spent their 2 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 to the end of the war in November 1918, over 1000 college-aged men, including more from New Hampshire, as well as large numbers from New York, passed through the Student Army Training Corps camp at New Hampshire College. Although several were former (now drafted) students of New Hampshire College, the majority, particularly those sent from New York, had never before attended a university or trade school. One-fifth of the men had never completed elementary school (Dooley 1919, p. 96).

Through the training detachment at New Hampshire College and the others across the country, working-class and educated men came together to form new, composite communities of drafted, previously unrelated individuals. They were bound together by wartime ideals which had, since the start of World War I, seen dramatic revisions in terms of American notions of citizenship and cultural difference, precipitated, in part, by an aggressive propaganda campaign by the Wilson administration (Wood 2014, p. 277; also see Creel 1920). As Wilson looked to the deliberate mobilization of emotions and ideas to galvanize Americans to enter the war in the spring of 1917, the Great War became in America peculiarly an affair of the mind (Kennedy 2004, p. 46; see also Benson 2010; Blakey 1970; Buitenhuis 1987; Vaughn 1980). These training detachments, along with the soldiers at the front lines 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. The men at the training camp of New Hampshire College became part of an ideologically connected war effort and national community.

This community was, drawing on the concept articulated by Benedict Anderson (2006), imagined. That is, the men passing through the New Hampshire College training camp never knew most of their fellow-members in the war effort and nation they were fighting for, they never met them face-to-face, or even heard of them, yet in the minds of each lived “the image of their communion” (Anderson 2006, p. 6). The men at the training camp, the professors and other students at New Hampshire College, and the town of Durham became part of a much larger system wherein education, government, commerce, and local populations worked together for the common goal of victory. 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 camp’s 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 were expected to follow strict military discipline “as a patriotic measure in co-ordination with the strict discipline of the men” (The New Hampshire 1918g, p. 1).

At the same time that the training camp bound its participants in an imagined national community of wartime ideal and effort for victory, the interaction of New Hampshire and New York men at the training camp also meant some of the “fellow-members” of the broader wartime imagined community met in reality. Here, they were
part of a new and distinct composite social unit, the exact mixture of which had never previously existed. These social actors interacted with each other and the material world around them in ways that were about more than just conforming to preordained definitions of citizenship and the nation (Wood 2014, p. 280). The New Hampshire training camp, and the others across the country, inherited, then, an interesting duality, being places where the imagined nation of wartime America was enacted, as well as places of composite human communities brought together to navigate in their own ways the physical and symbolic worlds created by World War I (Saunders 2004, p. 5).

In this paper, we present results from our ongoing documentary and archaeological exploration of the New Hampshire World War I training camp. The First World War, lying as it does on the cusp upon which history becomes archaeological (Saunders 2004, p. 5), has become only a recent focus of archaeological investigations. Many of these investigations have focused on survey and excavations of battlefields and frontlines (e.g., Banks and Pollard 2014; Doyle et al. 2005; Robertshaw and Kenyon 2008; Stichelbaut 2011). Archaeological approaches to the First World War have also, however, increasingly come to encompass interdisciplinary examinations of varied spaces and scales of both materialities and memories of the Great War (e.g., Audoin-Rouzeau and Becker 2002; Brown 2009; Saunders 2002, 2003, 2010, 2014; Saunders and Cornish 2009; Smith 2014).

This “vision of interdisciplinarity” has increased awareness of the need to engage with “Great War archaeology beyond the Western Front” (Saunders and Cornish 2009, p. 7). Indeed, while researching war fronts is critical, military-sites archaeology ever more recognizes the importance of complementing such work with non-battlefield archaeology (see Geier et al. 2010a). The vocational program that brought the New Hampshire training camp and others like it into existence, removed from the frontlines, has been a neglected aspect of World War I history and quite absent from archaeological inquiry. The resultant military camps developed by this program at universities across the US, the social and material lives of the lower-rank men who inhabited them, and the varied impacts of the government’s assertion of control over institutions of higher education through this program all carry material ramifications that deserve further investigation.

That said, 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 training camp sites available for such in-depth historical archaeological investigation is both limited and rapidly decreasing. We are fortunate, then, to have identified and excavated the remains of barracks built during the New Hampshire training camp even in the face of limitations from intensive campus development. Our work holds a unique and important opportunity to look through not just an archival but also a material lens at the lives of a largely forgotten class of American men, the drafted students and vocational workers brought together at the First World War Student Army Training Corps detachments established at universities across the country.

The Student Army Training Corps

The First World War had the capacity to make, unmake, and remake matter, individuals, cities, nations and continents in ways that, prior to this conflict, were largely
unimaginable (Saunders 2003, p. 1). America’s eventual involvement in the war pulled the country out of isolation and required the country to “discipline and mobilize its citizens in a manner from which history and geography had theretofore singularly spared them” (Kennedy 2004, p. viii). As President Wilson decided to have the US fight as an independent army, the United States entered the war facing both the considerable task of furnishing the Europeans with food and war materiel as well as an obligation to sustain a major militarily effort of its own (Kennedy 2004, p. 94).

The United States Army was, in many ways, unprepared for these complicated and significant tasks. One line of evidence of this comes from the fact that 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 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 (United States Bureau of Education 1919, pp. 13–14, 52–53). Prior to this survey, the War Department had no specific processes for recruiting and appointing specialists. Indeed, as late as January 1918, the War Department was asking college newspapers to publish letters from them 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” (The New Hampshire 1918a, p. 1).

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 (Levine 1986, p. 25–26; The New Hampshire 1918c, p. 4). At New Hampshire College, we see lament at what was perceived as a waste of these men’s skills: “Although the undergraduates of technical schools were better fitted for munitions and ship building work, 16 % of them did not wait to finish their training at school but entered the service at the declaration of war” (The New Hampshire 1918a, p. 1). Between such 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 (Levine 1986).

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 (Levine 1986, p. 25). 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?” (Levine 1986, p. 26). 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 following 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 short courses along the lines of the greatest need of the army” (Student Army Training Corps Files, Organization). Draftees of college age, regardless of educational status, could request to be sent to a vocational training detachment.

In September 1918, the National Army Training Detachment program was absorbed into another joint effort of the War Department and higher education: the Students Army Training Corps (SATC). SATC retained the established Vocational Division which accepted college-age men with little to no educational background, and created a new Collegiate Division that accepted high school graduates to take war-themed courses on a trimester schedule. The SATC Collegiate Division gave participants the opportunity to become officers, which made the program (as the vocational camps were among non-educated college-age men) a popular choice among high school educated college-aged men. Instead of being drafted to immediate front-line duty, both vocational and collegiate division men’s deployment would be delayed for their course of study, and they would hopefully obtain higher-ranking positions when they were sent overseas. The SATC collegiate and vocational divisions operated until December 1918 (the war ended in November).

When the Committee on Education and Special Training surveyed educational institutions to determine which had the necessary capacity for the vocational, and then collegiate, training for SATC, schools volunteered en masse. Although post-war government reports noted 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 (Dooley 1919, pp. 19–21). That is, 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 SATC officers’ training units, enrollment not only returned to normal levels, but in many cases surpassed pre-war numbers (Shearer 1979, p. 215; United States War Department 1918, pp. 6–7).

Despite the disruption of normal course structure and the imposition of military command, schools and educators recognized that the SATC camps saved “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” (Wigmore 1922, p. 61). Indeed, as a site of, at first a National Army Training Detachment training camp and then a SATC Vocational and Collegiate Divisions camp, New Hampshire College’s total enrollment by October 1918 was over 1100 individuals, far surpassing the pre-war enrollment of about 650 (New Hampshire College Bulletin 1918, p. 164; The New Hampshire 1918g, p. 1).
New Hampshire College’s Student Army Training Corps and its Archaeological Signature

The first vocational detachment arrived at New Hampshire College’s train station on May 16, 1918 (Student Army Training Corps Files, Distribution of Soldiers). 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 are the best fitted to give the highest efficiency” (Student Army Training Corps Files, Selection Blank). Just 10 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 (Student Army Training Corps Files, Hewitt to War Department). 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, Dean Hewitt made practical training the hallmark of his leadership on the program at New Hampshire College (Student Army Training Corps Files, Hewitt to War Department). Hewitt wanted his plan to foster the ideal of the citizen soldier, wherein trainees used their army-developed skills to assist the larger community. With this ideology, he emphasized hands-on training for the soldiers by building for the campus and community, resulting in notable physical transformations from this program. 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 a campus hall (Smith Hall), new archways and doors for the president’s building (Thompson Hall), new sidewalks, agricultural buildings, and a firehouse (Figs. 2 and 3). Considered a great service to the college, these tasks helped build the idea of soldiers as citizens-in-training (The New Hampshire 1918e, p. 4).

One of the most notable construction projects taken on by the SATC was the erection of two Barracks to house current and future camp soldiers. With Dean Hewitt calling for monthly soldier arrivals, he decided to have the carpentry, concrete, and electric sections of the camp build two new Barracks, each designed to house 200 men. The Barracks were specified at 115 ft long by 44 ft wide (35.05 × 13.4 m) and two stories high, built to War Department standards of 45 ft² (4.18 m²) and 70 ft³ per man (1.98 m³), constructed of spruce framing, and situated on evenly spaced concrete pillars (Hewitt, C.E. Correspondence 1918). A bathhouse was constructed that connected the two barracks (see Fig. 3).

In June 1918, less than 1 month after the first detachment arrived, orders went out from the camp for these Barrack’s almost daily to J. Herbert Seavey’s hardware shop in the nearby town of Dover, bringing nails, hammers, tools, rope, and other materials to the construction site; Iron pipe, doors, shower parts, and “rubbish burners” arrived from...
Boston, MA; “Calno board” for interior walls came from Haverhill, MA; entrance doors were shipped from Newbury, MA; and spruce boards were brought in from several nearby towns (Student Army Training Corps Files, Order Forms). The Barracks went up just as quickly as the orders went out and were completed by the end of July 1918 (Fig. 4). They were occupied by SATC soldiers until the end of the SATC program in December 1918 (they stood, used as regular college dorms, until 1971).

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” (Dooley 1919, p. 107). 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 (Dooley 1919, p. 107). At the University of Michigan, the camp dug a
Fig. 3  Map of New Hampshire College in 1920, the year after the SATC program ended and New Hampshire College acquired the buildings. The Barracks had not yet been renamed and are labeled here still with the SATC terminology. (Map from the New Hampshire College 1920–1 Undergraduate Bulletin)

Fig. 4  Time series of Barrack Construction over June and July 1918 (all photographs from Clement Moran Photography Collection, UNH Digital Archives, www.library.unh.edu/digital/)}
series of model trenches for telegraph and electric wiring practice (University of Michigan 1918; of note, such practice trench systems were common during the First World War and have been subject to archaeological investigations in Europe—for examples and discussion, see Brown and Field 2009; Saunders 2010). In other cases, national colleges accommodated camps through shifts in space rather than physical transformations. For instance, Georgia Tech 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 (Faulkner 1995). At the University of Illinois, the 3000 vocational men in their program lived in fraternity houses, requiring no new constructions (Levine 1986, p. 27).

While other colleges that hosted SATC programs clearly transformed their campuses, Dean Hewitt’s ideology for New Hampshire’s SATC, that aimed to have soldiers here seen as defenders of the country’s ideals, trade, and sovereignty abroad but also respected as caretakers of the country’s industry and ideals at home, and so emphasized hands-on training through the construction of new community and campus buildings, created the potential for a uniquely robust SATC archaeological record. Despite intense campus development, we were able to realize some of this potential through the identification and excavation of the Barracks area. While we did find some limited intact remains, this area is both heavily damaged and threatened by future development. We imagine with the rate of development on most campuses, this is also the case for what may be left from SATCs at other colleges across the country.

The Barracks

To gain a better sense of the SATC program at New Hampshire College, we focused our efforts on the Barracks. We did so because these were some of the few buildings constructed entirely anew by the SATC and, moreover, they were the only construction project built not just by the SATC soldiers but for them. We identified them as the best opportunity to study the lives and communities of soldier-students in the SATC here during the First World War.

Through archival research, we traced the construction and use-life of the Barracks. As discussed above, the Barracks were built between June and July 1918 by the students at the SATC training camp to both provide their own housing and practical experience in army trades (see Figs. 3 and 4). When the conflict ended, the War Department abruptly withdrew from the SATC program at campuses across the country. At New Hampshire College, and others, this abrupt withdrawal left the college in a financial battle with the government, attempting to claim reimbursement for materials, food, and training costs. When the camp system was dissolved, New Hampshire College was still waiting for over $93,000 in payments (Student Army Training Corps Files, Inventories).

As part of settling these claims, in 1919, New Hampshire College acquired the Barracks from the War Department (see Fig. 3). They converted them into all-male dorms that were eventually renamed East and West Hall and they stood as dorms until 1971 (Woodward 2012). A large student center, the Memorial Union Building, was built next to these buildings in the 1950s (see Fig. 2). In 1971, citing structural problems, the university ordered that they be demolished.
Although the university originally intended to turn the area into additional parking space for the student center, former residents and other students protested, insisting that the site become a much-needed “green space” and so it became East–west Park (Woodward 2012) (Fig. 5). Since 1971, this “park” next to the Memorial Union Building has been heavily modified. Most significantly, a large road, Quad Way, was built over part a big segment of this “park” and covers the majority of East (Barrack) Hall’s former location (see Fig. 2). The rest of the “park” has been filled with stairwells and sidewalks; together, the effect is that none would recognize the area as any kind of “park.” That said, it is nevertheless because of this vagary of campus history, with students protesting a parking lot in the early 1970s, that we were able to find any evidence of the Barracks today.

The Barracks constructed by the New Hampshire College SATC formed a “u” shape, with both buildings connected by a bathroom building, creating a distinct courtyard area between the buildings (see Fig. 3). Through superimposition of maps

Fig. 5 Map of the Barracks site (27-ST-96) showing archaeological activity and modern road, sidewalks, and other disturbances (trees, lampposts)
and aerial photographs, we determined that part of the bathroom that joined East and West Hall, the majority of West Barrack) Hall’s footprint, and some of the courtyard fell in the portion of the “park” not under Quad Way and so, even with sidewalks across it, there was at least some part of the Barracks accessible for survey and excavation (see Fig. 5). Here, in this limited grassy space now largely covered in sidewalks, we began an archaeological research program, over 40 years after the buildings were removed and almost 100 years after the camp turned an intellectual campus into a machine of war and the soldiers into (in the words of the University of Illinois’ SATC commanding officer) “cogs in a fighting machine” (Shearer 1979, p. 216). Through a combination of archival and archaeological research, we looked at the history of the New Hampshire College SATC camp to see the extent to which vocational soldiers conformed to their place in an imagined wartime nation based on citizenship and high standards of discipline, and the degree to which they created and maintained their own community identity on the ground in their daily lives in the camp.

**Barrack Excavations**

With no standing architecture left from the Barracks, we began our investigations by establishing a site grid (datum set at N5000 E5000) and conducting walk-over survey and shovel tests in undistributed areas of the “park,” working around trees, gardens, and numerous sidewalks (see Fig. 5). All shovel tests produced modern materials but also historic cultural materials and architectural debris from the Barracks. In addition, we found one small concrete pillar partly visible on the surface at N4979 E4989 during walk-over survey (Fig. 6, also see Fig. 5). These finds suggested that while demolished, materials, artifacts, and possibly features from the Barracks were preserved under the layer of landscaping soil that had been deposited during the creation of the East–west Park “green space.” Given the results of this initial survey, we applied for an assigned State Site Number and received 27-ST-96.

We then moved to excavation. We placed three 1 × 1 m units at 27-ST-96 in the area where we found the visible concrete pillar (see Fig. 5; units N4979 E4989; N4978 E4990; N4979 E4991). Working, again, between maps and aerial photographs, we

![Fig. 6 The concrete pillar discovered in unit N4979 E4989 (Photo by Jillian Price)](Photo by Jillian Price)
determined these were in the vicinity of the southern corner of the connecting bathroom (Fig. 7). To recover larger samples of architectural debris and, we hoped, evidence of soldiers’ discard behavior, we excavated four additional $1 \times 1$ m. We placed two where we were certain they would fall in a location that had been under the West Barrack (N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003). The other two were placed to target the courtyard.

Fig. 7 Overlay of excavation units in relation to former Barrack location (photo courtesy of UNH Archives)
between the Barracks (N 5001 E5002 and N5001 E5003). While we felt confident these two units were going to fall in the courtyard zone, our placement proved even more serendipitous than that—as we excavated and reexamined photos and maps, it became clear that these units were located right along the eastern open edge of the pillared West Barrack facing the courtyard.

It was college-age soldier-students who built the Barracks and it was college students who conducted their excavation during both a course on campus archaeology and a summer research grant from the University of New Hampshire Hamel Center for Undergraduate Research (Price 2013). We used a standard excavation approach, following the natural stratigraphy found within units. If stratams exceeded 10 cm, we broke stratum excavation into 10 cm levels. We transitioned to 5 cm levels within intact features (only one of which was encountered at the site). All excavation was done by trowel. All dirt was screened through 0.635 cm (0.25 in) screens and all artifacts were processed, cataloged, and curated in the University of New Hampshire Archaeology Lab.

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 exception was the complete concrete footing from the Barrack bathhouse foundation seen during survey and recovered fully in excavation (see Fig. 6). It appears that most or all other foundation pillars were removed in demolition, and any postholes had been destroyed during landscaping, but this smaller pillar from the bathhouse was left behind (see Figs. 6 and 7). Additionally, the two northernmost units (N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003), yielded numerous large fragments of vitrified clay sewer pipe (see Figs. 5 and 7). 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 in the units at excavation level depths of 20–70 cm supports this conclusion.

In the units targeting the courtyard between the Barracks (N5001 E5002 and N5001 E5003), our initial expectation was to recover mostly comingled, scattered artifacts from its use by SATC and UNH students, but during our excavation we found a feature that was a both highly concentrated and stratigraphically intact trash pit. These units, as indicated by superimposition of the unit layout map onto an aerial Barracks photo, are located along the eastern open edge West Barrack, suggesting that trash had been routinely discarded under the building’s crawl space (see Fig. 7). Looking again at Fig. 4 showing the construction of the Barracks, you can see that because the West Barrack was built into a hill, the eastern side had to be built on particularly tall pillars, creating a high, open crawl space under the building (this space is likewise visible in the later photograph in Fig. 7). Looking at these photographs of the Barracks’ construction, it is clear this crawl space was open and large enough that soldiers could readily walk into this space, and that they did so is evidenced by the storage of construction materials here (see Fig. 4). The fact that trash accumulated in this space, then, makes much sense.

**Recovered Artifact and Feature Analysis**

The Barracks’ close to 60-year existence requires a particularly “fine-grained” approach in the analysis of the materials we recovered in excavation in order to
distinguish an occupational phase of a mere several months (during the SATC camp) from a total occupation 100 times that length. The shift from soldier to student occupation should be, to some extent, represented in the trash pit we excavated, but the shift from camp to university construction material choices is difficult to see, especially since demolition removed all distinguishable evidence of construction phases. To overcome these limitations, we focused on understanding the artifacts in the wider context of regional economic development and market conditions and consumer values during the SATC and subsequent use-life of the Barracks as dorms (LeeDecker 1994). In the context of the site, this involved toggling between the material and documentary sources to tease apart the SATC signature and story (Wilkie 2006).

**Foundation Pillar** Again, an entire concrete foundation pillar was upside-down in unit N4979 E4989, at the location of the Barracks’ bathhouse (see Figs. 5, 6, and 7). Pieces of wood siding with nails intact were found directly beneath the pillar, confirming its connection to the Barracks. This pillar was short, measuring 55 cm × 42 cm × 13 cm (21.7 in × 16.5 in × 5.1 in). 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 50 cm × 40 cm or 19.7 in × 15.7 in), 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) (Fig. 8).

![Fig. 8 Cement “Wonder Mixer” purchased by Dean Hewitt for use in constructing the Barracks (note also the open liquor bottle on the bottom left of the mixer) (photograph from Clement Moran Photography Collection, UNH Digital Archives, www.library.unh.edu/digital/)](image-url)
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 (see Fig. 4). 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 0.25 in (0.64 cm) 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) (Concrete 1921). In this pillar, most aggregate is indeed larger than ¼ inch and the average aggregate size in the pillar is 0.25 in to 0.50 in (0.64 cm to 1.3 cm).

Furthermore, concrete foundations were a relatively novel idea. Portland cement was a new material, developed only in the early years of the twentieth century, and its potential uses were constantly debated in concrete trade journals (Concrete 1921). 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 and to some degree, cutting-edge, requirements of their trade.

**Sewer Pipe** Units N5008 E5001 and N5008 E5003 yielded 131 fragments of vitrified salt-glazed red clay sewer pipe (see Fig. 5). Most were segments of 12 in- (30.5 cm-) diameter pipes, and made of bright red, lightly glazed clay, although one large fragment...
was from a 6 in- (15.2 cm-) diameter pipe of darker brown, heavily glazed clay. In the lower levels (below 40 cm), this pipe was found in higher concentrations and in larger fragments, allowing for the partial reconstruction of several pipe segments (Fig. 9).

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 (Brick and Clay Record 1918a, pp. 168–170). The pipe fragments found on the camp site are consistent with this type, having diameters ranging slightly above and below 12 in. (30.48 cm), and showing evidence of having been joined with cement. The 6 in- (15.3 cm-) 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 advert in the college newspaper, The New Hampshire, for Akron vitrified clay pipe from Eastern Clay Co. in Boston (The New Hampshire 1918a, p. 2). 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 (Student Army Training Crops Files, Seavey to Hewitt). 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 adverts, both iron and clay pipe were available to the camp, easily ordered from Boston and shipped to campus via the Boston & Maine railroad (Student Army Training Corps Files, Inventories). 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. Clay was less expensive than iron, and given the intended temporary nature of the camp, longevity of material was not necessarily a concern. However, Dean Hewitt tended to teach the best and proper approaches to the camp’s various vocations and so he would have had little interest in cutting cost at the expense of quality.

If cost was not an issue, then, was an outside ideological factor 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 (Brick and Clay Record 1918b, p. 956). 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.

Trash Pit  As indicated above, one feature was found during excavations, a stratigraphic trash pit in N5001 E5003 and N5001 E5002 along the open crawl space along the eastern edge of the West Barrack facing the courtyard (Fig. 10, also see Figs. 5 and 7). This deposit, which extended beyond the two units in which it was sampled, is a sheet midden. These types of deposits, also known as 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). Glass recovered in the midden in these units was highly fragmented (the average weight per piece of glass in the midden is 0.97 g). This high fragmentation, along with low degree of vessel completeness upon reconstruction, suggests that this trash deposit was produced by varied non-intentional depositional activities in the crawl space itself (dropping, trampling) and swept in under the building from the courtyard. Such intermittent processes of deposition and removal that create sheet middens generally result in a lack of discernible stratigraphy (LeeDecker 1994, p. 353). At the Barracks, however, the midden’s location along the edge of the courtyard and under the building prevented any major clearing away of disposed items, resulting in a more concentrated artifact scatter. Moreover, the Barrack’s construction and subsequent use history resulted in discernable periods where trash could be deposited in this space—that is, at various points in the buildings’ history, this space under the West Barrack foundation was boarded over, barring entrance to the crawl space and preventing new trash from entering the midden.

Working through the photographic record of the building, we determined trash could have accumulated under the building in two distinct periods: (1) during the First World War SATC construction phase when the pillar foundation was not boarded over (pre-1919) and (2) when the siding was removed from the pillars, sometime in the late 1950s/early 1960s (An undated photo from UNH Digital Archives (www.library.unh.edu/digital/) 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, a published photograph from 1918 (The New Hampshire 1918h, p. 1) show that a small section of West Barrack was still uncovered. This area corresponds with the excavated trash pit.). If this crawl space had not been boarded over differentially, especially getting closed off at the end of the SATC construction, and had instead remained open over the use-life of the building, it would have been nearly impossible to securely distinguish SATC occupation from the UNH student
occupation (which began immediately after SATC occupation). The use-history of the building, however, created a stratified deposit from which it was possible to distinguish SATC World War I activity from later deposits (see Fig. 10).

The stratigraphy evident in the midden unit profile corresponds with the photographic record of the building use-life indicating two distinct periods of open crawl space where trash could accumulate. The upper portions of the profile contain post-demolition fill. This fill lies on top of intact sheet midden that contained materials dating to the 1950s/60s (including a partially reconstructable 1950s or 1960s Pepsi Bottle). A dark depositional layer lies directly below this stratum and this is the sheet midden produced during the SATC construction of the building. A “French square” style prescription bottle found in unit N5001 E5002 in this layer at an excavation depth of 35 cm bears a maker’s mark for Whitall Tatum & Co. in a style only used prior to 1920 (Lockhart et al. 2006). As the foundation was boarded over by early 1919, prior to any UNH student occupation of the buildings, the bottle could only have been deposited during the WWI SATC training camp era. Artifacts found in this dark depositional midden layer (lying below this diagnostic bottle at 35 cm below surface) represent, then, the activities of the training camp.

Artifacts dated in this way to the SATC training camp period include various bottle glass fragments (beer, champagne, medicine, and soda) and small fragments of 78RPM records. Given the soldiers at the camp were responsible for the Barracks’ construction and were also its occupants, we can work with a level of certainty that these materials were deposited by the camp’s soldiers. The training camp college-age men who deposited this trash, many of whom were from low-income families, had obligations to send the money that they earned as soldiers home to support family members. While
many of the soldiers here were operating on a limited budget, their trash indicates they nevertheless prioritized leisure activities involving music and alcohol consumption.

It is fun to imagine these materials coming from soldiers at the SATC camp smoking, drinking and talking together in the courtyard and that may account for their origin. However, the Barracks’ constant state of construction left the courtyard area cluttered with boards and supplies (see Fig. 4) and, again, supplies were stored under the Barracks throughout their construction. Given this, soldiers had numerous work-time opportunities to enter the space where we found this trash pit. Some of the bottle glass, therefore, may have actually been deposited during work hours.

Photographs do in fact show evidence of on-the-job drinking; look again at Fig. 8, the Wonder Mixer, and you will see 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 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 (Laws of the State of New Hampshire, Chapter 147, 1917). The SATC student-soldiers were evidently unconcerned by both this law as well as the military standards of discipline that sent men in the training camp who came to work drunk to a makeshift “prison” (Batchelder Letters). They literally drank on the job and discarded the evidence of drinking 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 Barracks meant that anyone could potentially find the alcohol-related refuse.

**Nation and Community in the Great War: Lessons from the New Hampshire College SATC Barracks**

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 how 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 “cogs in a fighting machine”; as illustrated by the soldiers’ choices of leisure intoxication. Dean Hewitt’s commitment to proper training and education likewise illustrates the continuation of old values
within the new wartime framework. The training camp is best viewed as constituted by the duality of both an imagined and an active community. 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 co-resident soldiering community.

Imagined Communities

All communities that expand beyond the scope of face-to-face interaction with every member have to be, to some degree, imagined (Anderson 2006, p. 6). The concept of national community takes such imaginings to another level, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a “deep, horizontal comradeship” (Anderson 2006, p. 7). 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” (Capozzola 2008, p. 18). 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. It is such imagining of fraternity that has made it possible, over the past two centuries, for “so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings” (Anderson 2006, p. 7).

The New Hampshire SATC camp embodies these imaginings of comradeship 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, 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, they 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. Through the War Aims course, required for all vocational and, later, SATC men, soldiers were taught the shared values of wartime fighting spirit and heard one explanation of exactly why the Central Powers were to blame for the entire conflict (Kennedy 2004, p. 57).

By learning these wartime values, soldiers participated in a second, much larger imagined community—the national community. As Benedict Anderson (2006, p. 6) has explained, “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 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, of 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 (2006, p. 5) 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.” In an era when almost 15% of national residents (including citizens and aliens) were foreign-born, this nationalist identity was certainly new for many.

Part of the establishment of the “antiquity” of an American identity relied on concepts of a shared history. Nations and “nation-ness,” are “cultural artifacts” that come into being through the “crossing of discrete historical forces” (Anderson 2006, p. 4). In many cases, as with World War I, these forces lead to an idealized view of a national history, used to help justify the nation’s actions. In the SATC training camps, all soldiers, regardless of ethnicity or their family’s length of residency in the United States, were required to take the 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 decade. Both groups were taught “topics that… prepare the student to grasp the ideas that make up the sum of our national purpose” (Frankel 1991, p. 73). 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.

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” (Levine 1986, pp. 96–97). 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” (New Hampshire College Bulletin 1918, p. 119, 1919, pp. 113–14). These types of course later developed into Western Civilization courses, which are the modern educational method of situating American nation-ness in history (Levine 1986).

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.

To drive this point home, all American college camps were supposed to hold an initiation ceremony for the Students Army Training Corp on October 1, 1918 at precisely 12 o’clock. At this moment, over 140,000 students were to become part of the United States Army, simultaneously pledging their allegiance to the American government and the war (Levine 1986, p. 28). In actuality, this “simultaneous” induction was in fact just as imaginary as the new community because the Spanish Flu was ravaging a large number of the camps and many remained quarantined on October 1. Indeed, at New Hampshire College, the one thousand vocational and collegiate trainees gathered on Thompson Hall lawn for induction not on October 1, but 9 days after this scheduled initiation. The college newspaper, however, reported that all other colleges had been initiated on October 10, rather than on the first day of the month (The New Hampshire 1918f, p. 1). The speech given then by New Hampshire College’s President Hetzel emphasized the need for soldiers to give up their personal strivings in exchange for the needs of their country: “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” (The New Hampshire 1918f, p. 1).

The SATC 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 shipments expedited, the camp ordered telephone books from Chicago, welding torches from New York City, and batteries from Philadelphia (Student Army Training Corps Files, Order Forms). 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.

The choices of certain materials reflects how the camp participated in this imagined cooperative network of economy and trade. 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 (Student Army Training Corps Files, Order Forms). 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 mentioned above, as part of their training at the New Hampshire SATC, soldier-students built chicken coops for local farmers and fixed privately owned cars all while charging no labor costs. 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” (The New Hampshire 1918i, p. 2). 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.

Active Communities

Despite participation in these various levels of imagined communities, industry providers, educational institutions, and student-soldiers alike all took opportunities to turn this new idea of community to their advantage and live in actualized, active ways as well. We consider the active practices of these three groups in turn.

Industry producers of architectural materials routinely marketed their product as the best choice for serving the country’s needs. As detailed above, 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 the war effort (Student Army Training Corps Files, Seavey to Henderson). He may have acted like he was going along only with his patriotic duty, but the war also did wonders for his personal income.

Educational institutions participating in SATC saved their colleges financially and found creative ways for traditional education to continue in the face of military control. At New Hampshire College, we see before the war, Dean 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 twentieth century), when he ran the SATC camp he actually was able to have students work with this new material in the production of sidewalks and the Barracks’ foundation (Garvin 2001, p. 64; The New Hampshire 1918b, p. 4). Hewitt was even able to order, on government funds, at least one new “Wonder Mixer” for this process (although photographs suggest he may have even ordered two) (Student Army Training Corps Files, Order form #5278). 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 (The New Hampshire 1918d, p. 3).
Meanwhile, another New Hampshire College Professor, Dr. 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 (see Fig. 2). In 1918, no doubt 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 (Student Army Training Corps Files, Organization; Milne 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.

While college faculty manipulated their national duties for education’s benefit, student-soldiers 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 not the only community they were participating in during the SATC. SATC 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. The 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. After the armistice, only about one-quarter of the vocational men stated that they wanted to “make the trip” overseas to fight and “it was taken for granted that the majority wanted to go home as soon as possible” (The New Hampshire 1918h).

An investigation of the Barracks’ trash pit provides the best evidence for the soldiering community’s actual life. 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. The midden reveals the economic capacities and power structure of the camp, both by what is and what is not represented in the trash.

One example of artifacts not represented in the trash or on the Barracks grounds is bullets. Bullets have been found to be very common at residential military campsites in other contexts, entering the archaeological record through activities such as accidental dropping during the cleaning of weapons (Balicki 2010, p. 71). 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-week intensive vocational training, emphasizing 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 the campus may also be related to the overextension of the US Army in the First World War. It was not just manpower that was lacking to fuel America’s role in the war, supplies were in low numbers as well (Yockelson 1998). Draftees at traditional training camps, in fact, parodied the Army’s supplies shortage in song and poetry (see Gazzman 1917, p. 123, “The Simulating of the Green”). At the New
Hampshire College training camp, supplies likewise appear tight. 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 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” (Student Army Training Corps Files, Hetzel to Commandant, First Naval District). 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 one 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” (The New Hampshire 1918e, p. 2). 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 community. The imagined concepts of nationality had failed to create model citizen soldiers; through co-residence in the Barracks, soldiers preserved cultural values of group solidarity and a strong aversion to legal or military control.

Concluding Thoughts

Armies are human communities and archaeology provides an important means of addressing the lived experiences of those who comprised them, experiences that were not always on the front lines and were not always included in archival records of war (Geier et al. 2010b, p. viii; Tunwell et al. 2015, p. 234). While limited by several factors, most notably extensive contemporary campus development, we were nevertheless able to bear out the benefits of an archaeological look at the lives of those involved in the Student Army Training Corps during World War I, a largely overlooked aspect of the period’s history.

At the New Hampshire College training camp, working between documentary and archaeological materials, we found the interrelated duties of states, educational institutions, businesses, government, and individuals indeed merged into the American
wartime imagined community here, but we also found lived experiences that did not always conform to imagined standards. Here, a real, active, and distinctly human community formed out of the young men from diverse backgrounds, professors, and the local community combined together at this camp. In the actualized experience of the training camp, people materialized their own complicated ways of balancing the demands of citizenship, difference, duty, and nation.

Our project highlights the War Department’s influence during World War I extended into fairly remote areas of the country and required new forms of cooperation between education, economy, and the government. World War I has been identified by some as the first “total war” and indeed, seeing the Army “occupy” this small, rural, state college, and many others like it, we can appreciate the extent to which many varied aspects of our country were incorporated into larger networks of war.

There is no doubt that the life of the students, professors, and surrounding communities at the other 156 schools (many of which were equally rural) that hosted collegiate SATC camps were also altered in interesting ways. Each of these camps has the potential to have produced an archaeological record and we hope others are inspired by our work to seek out this signature, recognizing, of course, that this material signature may be hard to find for various reasons. Many camps used pre-existing buildings to house the program which reduces the chance of finding material remains from the SATC distinguishable from the rest of the building use over campus history. Also, like the University of New Hampshire/ New Hampshire College site, many others will almost certainly have sustained damage from campus construction. These facts, while reducing the chance of finding material evidence, do not reduce the imperative for these sites to be studied now, especially before further damage removes any remaining evidence of this little-known aspect of World War I and educational history. In a way that documentation alone cannot, archaeology provides a view of the lived experiences and practices of the community of vocational soldiers, who were drafted (willingly or not) to serve a community that, before the Great War, had not existed.
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