

HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES CAVALRY AND ARMOR ASSOCIATION EST 1885*

The period from 1881 up to the Spanish American War has been called the United States Army's Renaissance.

In that span of years the foundations of American military professionalism were laid down. This was no precise and planned development, but a groping evolution that materialized from and overcame what has been called the Army's Dark Ages—the period from Civil War up to 1880, when declining strength, inadequate appropriations and pay, ineffective organization, wide dispersion, a provincial existence, and a hostile society, all combined to reduce the Army to such a low estate that a rising sentiment for reform and position was inevitable.

It was a sign of the times when on November 9, 1885, a group of cavalry officers at Fort Leavenworth met to form the U.S. Cavalry Association, for the professional unity and improvement, and the advancement of the cavalry service generally.”

The measure of the mounted officers' thirst for status and professional development is evident in their decision to organize an association in the face of many obstacles. Cavalrymen were scattered about the country from coast to coast and border to border.

In an Army numbering less than 27,000 officers and men, there were about ten regiments of cavalry, containing as potential members of the Association only 424 officers. The regiments were split into small detachments and parceled out over a remote frontier, charged with such assorted duties as fighting Indians, controlling them on reservations, guarding and operating stage lines, safeguarding settlers, protecting railroads, restricting the depredations of

* Updated 2008

desperadoes, and influencing calm in labor disputes—in sum, a police force rather than an army.

Under these circumstances an officer had little hope of finding an opportunity to acquire leadership experience through the command of sizable units in maneuvers (although cavalrymen in particular gained self-reliance in the very fractionalization of their units, which placed a full load of responsibility on officers serving in small isolated commands far removed from their superiors). And campaigns of a size comparable to that of 1876, when Custer was overwhelmed at Little Big Horn, by 1885 were highly unlikely. For even though General Crook was actively campaigning in Arizona territory against Geronimo and his Chiricahua Apaches, and Wounded Knee was yet five in the future, this was the twilight of Indian uprising. The officer corps had little more than the peacetime alternative—the exercise of theory to promote professional qualification.

The creators of the Cavalry Association took their problems into account in organizing their society. To contend with the matter of dispersion they established not only the headquarters at Fort Leavenworth, but branches at West Point and in Indian Territory at Fort Reno. They demonstrated a fine touch for the cultivation of higher authority and an alertness to extra-military considerations by conferring honorary membership on the Commanding General of the Army, General Will T. Sherman; on Lew Wallace, soldier, lawyer, governor, diplomat, and author of *Ben Hur*; on Phillip St. George Cooke and Williams S. Harney, distinguished retired general officers; and on two ex-generals of the Confederacy, Fitzhugh Lee, who became governor of Virginia as the Association was being launched, and “Fightin’ Joe” Wheeler, then a member of Congress from the State of Alabama. To these were added John Codman Ropes, distinguished military historian of the day, and Professor Jean Roemaker, vice president of City College of

New York and author of *Cavalry, Its History, Management and Uses in War*. Other influential individuals would be added.

In the matter of active officership of the Association, the founders elected a Medal of Honor winner, Major Abraham K. Arnold, then of the 6th Cavalry, as president, and Captain Theodore J. Windt of the 4th Cavalry as secretary. The membership would turn the general officer ranks for Arnold's successor, setting a precedent that holds to this day. But more on the presidents later.

Fort Leavenworth offered auspicious surroundings for the development of professional activity. Here in 1881 Sherman had established the School of Application for Infantry and Cavalry, a great stride forward in the building of a military educational system for the Army. It had been Sherman who sent Emory Upton to Europe and Asia to study the workings of foreign armies, and Upton had confirmed the place of the service school in the development of a professional officer corps. With their mature professionalism, European armies were the object of careful scrutiny in America, where military professionalism was yet in the formative stages. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the papers presented and discussed in early Cavalry Association meetings turned on the European scene.

The early months of Association activity are somewhat vague due to paucity of records. A general lack of a sense of history on the part of successive administrations, not limited to the early years, has permitted the dissipation of much valuable archival material. The saving feature has been the society's publication, which today constitutes a priceless record.

The first issue of the *Journal of the U.S. Cavalry Association* came from the steam press of Kecheson and Reeves at Leavenworth, Kansas, in March of 1888. The preoccupation of the American military with European armies is evident in two articles: "Some German Ideas on

Cavalry Gathered from ‘Conversations on Cavalry’—Prince Kraft de Hohenlohe-Ingelfingen,” and “The French Cavalry; Its Organization, Armament, Remount Service, Schools, Instruction, Drill and Tactics.”

A great debate of the period—whether the mounted soldier should be armed with saber or revolver, or both—runs through several articles. Other items discuss remounts, a new-type field artillery piece, and devices to assist the cavalryman in firing the pistol and carbine efficiently from the back of a horse.

Equally interesting with article content is a list of Association members appearing at the back of Volume I, Number 1. There is Captain Myles Moylan, who commanded A of the 7th Cavalry with the Rena battalion at Little Big Horn. Captain H.W. Lawton, who rendered conspicuous service in bringing Geronimo to heel, is a member. Soldier-author Charles King, progenitor of the Ernest Haycox School of Literature, is there. There is Lieutenants W.C. Brown and J.V.S. Paddock, whose names are inscribed respectively in the history of the Sheepeater war of Idaho and the Milk River engagement in Colorado, in 1879. Rufus Fairchild Zogbaum appears—artist and author, faithful delineator of military and naval subjects.

And there is Major Brevet, Colonel Guy V. Henry, holder of the Medal of Honor for action at Cold Harbor in '64, and severely wounded at the Battle of Rosebud with Crook in '76; later Major General Guy V. Henry, whose son, Major General Guy V. Henry, Retired, a distinguished soldier in his own right, is today honorary president of the society of the mounted arm.

Publication of that first list in March 1888 apparently gave the organization a shot in the arm, for the membership jumped from 182 to 310 by June and was pushing 400 in November on the third anniversary of the Association. Joining up were Frederick W. Benteen, Winfield S.

Edgerly and E.S. Godfrey, all of the Benteen battalion at Little Big Horn; Samuel B.M. Young, Adna R. Chaffee, J. Franklin Bell and John J. Pershing, all destined to be Chiefs of Staff of the United States Army; James Parker, another Medal of Honor recipient and a future Association president (1915-1917); and Camillo C.C. Carr, Jacob A. Augur and Ezra B Fuller, future editors of the *Cavalry Journal*.

In its first 75 years of publication, 27 officers have held the editorial chair of the magazine of mobile warfare, as it is sometimes called today. Fifteen have been West Pointers, and eight went on to become general officers—Carr, William H. Carter, Charles D. Rhodes, Robert C. Richardson, Jr., Karl S. Bradford, Oliver L. Haines, Charles S. Kilburn and Fenton S. Jacobs. Of these, Carter, who won the Medal of Honor in Arizona in 1881, holds the distinction of having served the Association in both editorial and executive capacities: he was editor as a captain in the period of 1892-1897, and president as a general, from 1908 to 1914 and again from 1917 to 1921.

Six of the 19 presidents to date of the mounted society were Chiefs of Cavalry, encompassing the full period of existence of that office from 1920 to 1942—Major Generals Willard Holbrook, Malin Craig, Herbert Crosby, Guy Henry, Leon Kromer and John Herr. One of these, Malin Craig, was Army Chief of Staff from 1935 to 1939, bridging the tours of Generals MacArthur and Marshall.

The trend in presidential rank has been upward through the years, from Major Arnold to the present incumbent, four-star General Bruce C. Clarke, who recently retired from the Army. All of the top officers of the Association, those already mentioned and these others—I.D. White, Ernest N. Harmon, Hobart R. Gay, Willis D. Crittenberger, John H. Collier, Williston B. Palmer, George W. Read, Jr., and Willard G. Wyman—have made significant contributions to the

professional society. But it is the second president, Brigadier General Wesley Merritt, who deserves a large share of credit for the success, indeed perpetuation, of the Association and its magazine.

A West Pointer, Class of 1860, Merritt graduated into the Civil War, rising to become a general before the age of 30. Assuming the presidency of the Association in September of 1887, Merritt was retained by the membership for a 20 year tenure, until January 1908. His great contribution was to give prestige to the organization in the critical years of consolidation. He was largely instrumental in boosting the society over the hurdle caused by the Spanish American War, when all officers except the vice president were at the front, resulting in a single issue of the *Journal* in 1898, four difficult numbers in 1899, and a complete suspension of operations in 190 and 1901.

In an inspirational letter to the membership Merritt in April 1902 threw his weight behind continuation of the organization and its magazine. "I have been told," he wrote, "by more than one officer whose advancement in the cavalry service has been marked, that much of the success was due to the influence of the studies induced by the Cavalry Association."

The studies to which Merritt referred, those papers presented before various groups of members and as articles in the *Journal*, ranged over a field of subjects of logical interest to the military man, and particularly the mounted soldier: tactics, techniques, training weapons, doctrine, equipment, organization, horsemanship and horse mastership, education, personalities, and history, to mention some major areas.

Discussions were lively and detailed. In the *Journal* for July 1903, for example, 30 officers discoursed on the Johnson bridle bit. To stimulate such professional interest the Association in 1897 had launched an essay contest. Back of a requirement that essays be based

on assigned subjects lay a plan to publish a history of the American Cavalry. Although this never materialized, the professional activity engendered by the annual contest inspired the preparation of much good material for the magazine.

In the 1903 contest, for instance, a board composed of Generals J.H. Wilson and Fitzhugh Lee and Colonel Arthur L. Wagner (the latter the noted educator at the Leavenworth school), judging material on the basis of historical accuracy, professional excellence, and literary merit, awarded top honors to Captain James G. Harbord for his treatise on "The History of the Cavalry of Northern Virginia (Confederate) During the Civil War." As Harbord's advancement in the service would be marked (he was to rise to Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army), his serves as a case in point in confirmation of General Merritt's remark on the value of Association studies with relation to professional advancement.

With the close of the Spanish American War the United States Army embarked on what has been called the second phase of its Renaissance. In its sphere, the Cavalry Association moved forward. Its gathering professional strength is evidenced in many ways in this period, and not least by the October 1902 membership list, which carries the names of Generals Arthur MacArthur, Leonard Wood, and Tasker Bliss. It was at this time, too, that the *Journal* got a face-lifting from an unexpected source.

Frederic Remington, whose pen and rush contributed so materially to the enduring historical record of our Western frontier, was a life member of the Cavalry Association. In 1898 Remington visited the camp of the 3d Cavalry at Tampa, Florida, where the regiment was staging for the Santiago campaign. The artist, on his way to cover the war in Cuba for *Harper's Weekly*, was a close friend of Captain Francis H. Hardie, who commanded Troop G of the 3d. During the visit Remington's attention was drawn to one of G's noncommissioned officers,

Sergeant John Lannen. A Superb rider and an imposing figure, the soldier impressed Remington as the perfect example of a cavalryman. He made rough sketches of Lannen.

From these roughs Remington later made two finished sketches, which he presented to the Cavalry Association in 1902, as the *Cavalry Journal* was resuming publication. His excellent drawing of a frontier cavalryman appeared on the front cover of the *Journal* in January 1903. It was to hold this position for almost 40 years, until July 1942, and through the years would acquire the label “Old Bill.” The second sketch, of a cavalryman riding away from the viewer at a gallop, appeared on the back cover and as a tailpiece inside the magazine for many years. But it was the front cover sketch that had feel, character, and authenticity. Always a branch of great *esprit* and highly conscious of history and tradition, the Cavalry took the Remington masterpiece to its heart. It appears to this day on the masthead page of the professional magazine of the mounted arm, a trademark of mobility in war.

As the impact of the Army’s renaissance and the Cavalry Association’s example became increasingly felt, other branch associations and magazines began to appear on the military scene. Many officers of Infantry, Artillery, and other services had joined the Cavalry Association, drawn by community of professional interest. Inevitably a desire for greater concentration on branch affairs intruded, and the various specialists took steps to form their own organizations.

The year 1892 saw the creation of the Coast Artillery Association and magazine. Infantrymen launched an organization in 1893 and a journal in 1904. Field Artillerymen put their society under way in 1910, and between 1920 and 1946 the services lined up—Engineers, Ordnance, Quartermaster, Transportation, Signal and Chemical—while in more recent times Finance, Military Police and Army Aviation have joined the group. These organizations and their “trade journals of war” over the years have rendered a clear service to the Army and the nation.

With the 20th Century came mechanization. Its application to military purposes had broad implications, especially for the Cavalry arm. As the tank moved onto the battlefields of World War I its element of protection was in ascendant, for it was designed to breach the trench stalemate by overcoming the machinegun and barbed wire. Yet it was an augury for the future when General Pershing placed the Tank Corps under command of a cavalryman, Brigadier General Sameul D. Rockenbach, longtime member of the Cavalry Association and a contributor to the *Journal's* pages as far back as 1894.

One of his younger officers was Captain George S Patton, Jr., who a quarter-century later in another global conflict would do so much with this machine which he helped to introduce to the battlefield. Incidentally, the careful researcher in the *Cavalry Journal* may trace the career of Association member Patton through articles under his by-line ranging from lieutenant to general and spanning three decades.

World War I brought another crisis in Cavalry Association affairs. The secretary-treasurer-editor retired Lieutenant Colonel Fuller, in poor health but carrying on, was awaiting replacement. But as Fuller noted in the July 1917 issue of the *Journal*, "everybody who can wants to go to war, and those who can't don't want the job." He suggested that it might be better to suspend operations as had been the case at the turn of the century. But he got out three more issues, and with the April 1918 number the *Cavalry Journal* went into suspense for two years, with 1919 a complete blank.

As it has on the occasion of the other interruption, the *Journal* came out of this one with a new face. Old Bill still graced the cover, but page size was expanded and layout revamped. Major Robert C. Richardson, Jr. moved into the chair in replacement of Fuller. And now the Association's base of operations was moved to Washington, D.C. The organization had need to

be on the scene in the Nation's Capital, for its future, inextricably interwoven with the future of the Cavalry, was by no means definitely assured. As Major LeRoy Eltinge put it in April 1920 revival issue, "the Cavalry of the Army emerged from the World War in poorer condition than any arm of the service." Indeed, there was much to be done.

That issue opened fittingly enough with an inspirational message to the Cavalry from General John J. Pershing, designed to carry the arm through critical times. The theme running through the number was hopeful: "the future of cavalry lies in its mobility".

It was in this period that the Army, recognizing the real contribution of the unofficial professional associations and journals to the profession of arms, authorized the assignment of active duty personnel to the editorial-secretarial posts; the task up to this time had been carried out in their spare time by a small number of highly dedicated officers.

Under the new arrangement the organizations rightfully retained their freedom of operation, although in the Thirties they lost the revenue of advertisers when Congress wrote into the appropriations bill a rider prohibiting publications run by active duty staffs from taking paid advertising—a far cry from those years in the Eighties and Nineties when the *Journal* carried a lively advertisers' section; when ads were oozing with testimonials and even the Post Chaplain at Fort Leavenworth was delighted to give his endorsement to Woodley's *Sans Pareil*, the Great Army Remedy for the Preservation of the Hair!

At the close of World War I the thinking with respect to employment of the tank was still far from clear. There was indecision as to which of the ground arms should have cognizance over development. The Tank Corps was dissolved and tank development placed under the Chief of Infantry. The general theory of mechanization however was assigned to the Cavalry.

Few professionals yet saw the possibilities inherent in armor—that Cavalry might logically inherit armor, and that armor possessed the classic cavalry characteristics of mobility, firepower and shock action (now shock effect), and therefore the capability of carrying on the cavalry role. Daniel Van Voorhis, Adna R. Chaffee, Jr., and a few more spoke out. But the horse had an attraction to the heart as well as the head of the cavalryman and even at the time in the Thirties when the 7th Cavalry Brigade (Mechanized) was formed, it was generally considered to be a professional hazard for an officer to identify himself with the new medium. Few cavalrymen were prepared to trade the horse for the tank and perhaps compromise their careers. Among those who stepped to the new field, however, were two future presidents of the mounted society, I.D. White and Willis D. Critenberger.

Through these years of growing pains the Cavalry Association gave some attention to mechanization through the pages of the *Journal*, but more to the horses. Gradually the articles had taken the place of the paper of earlier times. The Association became essentially its magazine, and there through the Thirties many of the big names of World War II put in appearance, and not all were cavalrymen: Jonathan M. Wainwright, Lucien K. Truscott, Joseph W. Stilwell, Maurice Rose, Robert W. Grow; and in 1931 Major Dwight D. Eisenhower, authoring an article on “War Policies.”

As war flared once again in Europe, the crisis developing in the Army over the Cavalry role deepened. Events came to a head with a rush. In 1940 the Army bypassed the traditional ground arms by organizing an Armored Forces, while at the same time, in the Cavalry famous horse regiments were partially and then completely mechanized. In 1942 the offices of the chiefs of Combat Arms (Cavalry, Infantry, Artillery) were abolished. As a crowning blow to the

Cavalry, the famous First Cavalry Division was dismounted and sent to the Southwest Pacific as a foot unit.

A hint of a struggle attendant upon those events is apparent in the words of Major General John J. Herr, last Chief of Cavalry (1938-1942), and president of the Cavalry Association from 1939 to 1945. The quotation is from his book, *The Story of the U.S. Cavalry* (Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1935), written with Edward S. Wallace and published not long before his death:

What caused this sudden and extreme action? It was probably a combination of factors. The great successes of the German panzers (which nobody denied) over the good roads in the flat country of Northern Europe had their effect on the extremely motor-conscious American public and its tendency to rush *en masse* to extremes. The horse was dead! Long live the motor! Thus reasoned many people who had never tried to cut cross-country, between the hard roads, in their shiny, chromium-plated, streamlined pride of the Detroit production line and knew nothing about the use of horses. That there was influence brought to bear by certain industries which would profit heavily by the production of the enormously expensive tank and other mechanized vehicles are almost certain. Then, there was the ever-eternal green-eyed monster of jealousy which had been aroused in the breasts of the other services, especially among soft and inactive officers behind desks, over the color and glamour attached to the cavalry, over the good times which officers of that branch enjoyed in their sports at all cavalry posts, and over

the certain indefinable social prestige which the man on horseback, the cavalier, the *hidalgo*, the gentleman, has always had over the men on foot. All these influences combined, and amidst the excitement at the outbreak of war managed to eliminate what they called an archaic branch.

Whatever the reason, the horse departed the Army, and the mounted arm was beset by internal divisions that threatened its professional base. The Cavalry Association suffered a well, and partly by its own hand.

With the U.S. Army at its wartime peak in strength, the *Infantry Journal* soared to well over 100,000 subscriptions, exclusive of the Overseas Edition. Not to the *Cavalry Journal*. Against a potential represented by 16 armored divisions full of cavalymen, a cavalry division, many armored cavalry groups and squadrons, and many separate tank and tank destroyer units, the *Cavalry Journal* reached a subscription peak of little more than 7,000. This can be attributed to a failure to break with the past and step out resolutely to embrace the new medium—armor—which had absorbed the great percentage of branch members.

As German panzer forces lashed out across European battlefields, Russian horse cavalry galloped across *Cavalry Journal* pages. Armor and mechanization got some space, but a provisional platoon of horse-mounted soldiers in the Italian campaign was likely to receive equal attention with the exploits of an American armored division. And there was continuing attention to foreign horse cavalry, horse breeding, and equestrian sports. The Association lost many sincere professionals from its membership rolls.

In World War II the Cavalry Association and *Cavalry Journal* met a war which did not put operations at least temporarily on ice. But in clinging to the past the Association came close

to sealing its own doom. The low point was late 1947, when subscriptions dropped to around 1,800. But the president of the Association had been not only a horse cavalryman, but a commander of armor on World War II battlefields. In mid 1946, under General White's aegis, a small group of professionals rallied around and put the organization in tune with realities. The name was changed to U.S. *Armored Cavalry Association*. The magazine became *Armored Cavalry Journal*. Content increasingly reflected the new order.

In all fairness it must be noted that all service journal suffered a share of difficulties growing out of the postwar ebb. The league-leading *Infantry Journal*, pulled down 20,000 copies, in the late Forties put forward a merger proposal which in essence suggested the liquidation of the Associations and journals of Cavalry, Field Artillery, and Coast (Antiaircraft) Artillery, with all assets to be turned over to a new organization and magazine of Army-wide implication and title, based on the Infantry Association's existing plant and staff, with some minor representation of the other three organizations on the governing body.

By 1953 the two Artillery organizations had joined this Association of the U.S. Army in the *Combat Forces Journal* (today *Army*). The members of the Armored Cavalry Association voted down the proposition, seeing it as a sub-merger, and desiring to retain a strong voice in behalf of their own troubled branch. The Association position was admirably represented by Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keys in high-level meetings with advocates of a merger of the several combat arm magazines and societies.

From initial negotiations in 1948 through *Armor's* Nov.-Dec. 1952 editorial and later reaffirmation by Executive Council resolution, the mounted organization has consistently supported the concept of an Army-wide Association, while maintaining a firm stand on behalf of branch societies and journals. This support continues today. A sentiment for perpetuation, it may

be noted parenthetically, was not unusual for an organization with a lineage such as that of the mounted society. Many military families may be traced through the history of the mounted organization and the pages of its publication, from distinguished father to distinguished son. The Cavalry family tree is liberally sprinkled with the accomplishments of several generations of Henry's and Howzes, Holbrooks, Reads and Pattons, to note a few examples.

Mid-century will go down in the history of the society of the mounted arm and its publication as a moment of resurrection. For it was then that Congress passed the Army Organization Act of 1950. The legislature made of record an evolution which had been in process for several decades. The passage that cleared the air read: *The Armor shall be a continuation of the Cavalry.*

The steps remaining to be taken were obvious, and the Association's Executive Council moved immediately to implement them. On the heels of the legislative action the Armored Cavalry Association became the U.S. Armor Association. The magazine became simply ARMOR. The July-August 1950 issue came out re-designed from cover to cover, setting a style which would win for the publication certificates of award in the Magazine Shows of 1951 and 1952, sponsored by the American Institute of Graphic Arts.

Eighteen months later the society, breaking the precedent of 25-member annual meetings in one room of Washington's Army and Navy Club, moved to Fort Knox, the Home of Armor, for its annual reunion. As many officers attended the business session in Theater No. 1 as had been on duty in the ten regiments of cavalry existing in the Army when the society was launched at Fort Leavenworth 66 years before.

The election of General White to the presidency in 1946 had been a sign of the times so far the Association and its magazine were concerned. For he was the first of a sextet of

presidents, including Generals Harmon, Gay, Crittenberger, Collier, and Read, who, while career members of the Cavalry arm and horsemen all, commanded armor on World War II battlefields or served on top staffs having direction over armored units. This development in the transition from horse to horsepower was carried a step farther in 1955 when the Association elected General Palmer as its head—the first officer with armor background whose basic branch before World War II was other than Cavalry. This repeated in 1962 when the incumbent president, General Clarks, a distinguished World War II combat commander of armor, was elected president of the Association, succeeding General Willard G. Wyman.

Writing from Tokyo in 1948 in observance of the *Cavalry Journal's* 60th anniversary of service devoted to “keeping the military profession abreast of the cavalry arm in the art of war,” General of the Army Douglas MacArthur said: “During these decades no other branch has experienced greater change in weapons, in technique, and in tactical requirement. Discarding the horse and the saber to keep pace with the increasing tempo and violence of modern war, the cavalryman speedily adjusted himself to armored mechanization and commensurate firepower, firmly to hold his historic role of the far-flung and rapid movement echelon. In this he demonstrated with striking clarity that the invincible *esprit* which has characterized his past yet carries him to the vanguard of every advance, an irresistible force toward victory.”

A historical event took place in 1962, a TANK DESIGN CONTEST, sponsored by the U.S. Armor Association.

In evolving plans for the contest in November 1961, Lieutenant General Arthur G. Trudeau, retired, then the Army's Chief of Research and Development stated. “I am convinced that the modern Army demands a new and revolutionary change in tank development philosophy.” With that statement a tank design contest was proposed.

Details of the contest were formulated by a committee of representatives from the Department of the Army, USCONARC, U.S. Army Armor Center, and the U.S. Armor Association. The purpose of the contest was to develop ideas for a combat vehicle, or component thereof, which would substantially increase the shock affect of Armor in operations over all typed of terrain.

Maximum publicity, using all available media, was instrumental in achieving fullest support. Several foreign publications carried the rules of the contest and an entry blank in their issues.

When the contest ended 31 August, 268 entries had been received. One hundred forty-one were received from the U.S. Army, from privates to lieutenant general. Eleven were received from the Marines, three from the Navy, two from the Air Force, 80 from U.S. civilians, and 31 representing 12 foreign countries.

The diversification of the entries is indeed interesting. An entry was received from Papua; one from Sweden; one from New Zealand; one from Luxembourg (second place winner); one from India; five from Holland; one from Greece; eleven from Germany (one the 9th place winner); two from England; four from Australia; and one from Sudan.

Thirty-one of the fifty states were represented which is indicative of the widespread interest. Entries arrived at the Association headquarters in all sizes, shapes and forms and by every conveyance including diplomatic pouch.

In addition, many inquiries were received at the Association headquarters in Washington asking for information about the contest and requesting entry blanks.

Representatives of Combat Development Agencies, Office of the Chief of Research and Development, the Research Engineering Directorate at the Army Tank-Automotive Command,

Combat Vehicles Division, the U.S. Army Armor Board, and other qualified individuals participated in the preliminary judging.

The final judging committee consisting of General Bruce C. Clarke, retired, President of the U.S. Armor Association, Lieutenant General Dwight E. Beach, Chief, Research and Development, Department of the Army, and Major General Joseph E. Bastion, Jr., Commanding General, U.S. Army Armor Center, Fort Knox, selected the top ten winners.

The winners appear elsewhere in this story along with the statement of the judges expressing their appreciation for the all-out support given the contest.

Each entrant received a letter thanking him for his participation in the contest. All entries were turned over to the Department of the Army for further evaluation. It is pointed out that all reasonable precautions were taken to protect the property rights of each contestant.

The Fort Knox Public Information Officer handled all the details in conjunction with the spot news release of pictures and stories of the first four winners. The material was given maximum distribution and all releases were made simultaneously with the publishing of the November-December issue of ARMOR.

The Editor expressed his appreciation for the excellent support.

Many entries were received from teenagers. One wrote, "I am 15 and read my father's ARMOR Magazine. He is now in Korea but sends ARMOR home to me. I hope someday to be an Armor officer just like my Dad. Please forgive my spelling as it is my poorest subject in school. Anyway, I make A's and hope to go to the Point."

Another young lad submitted his entry and later informed us he had moved and said he wanted us to make sure our records were straight so we would know where to send his prize.

In corresponding with the number two winner, Sergeant G.L. Eischen writes, “I would appreciate very much if you could send me some of the ARMOR issues in relation to the recent tank design contest. Our army library has no more a subscription to your interesting magazine. The reason might be that our small army has no Armor equipment at all.”

The U.S. Armor Association performed a tremendous service in promoting the Tank Design Contest. Many worthwhile ideas were received and numberless hours were spent in the preparation of the many excellent entries.

One officer, a former engineer, remarked, “If some of the contestants spent an hour on their drawings, they must have spent 100 hours.” And, the professional quality of many of the entries supports this statement. The U.S. Army had received a reservoir of ideas and after all have been analyzed it is certain that something worthwhile will be achieved as a result of this research and development brain storming.

Awards to the winners were presented by appropriate representatives of the U.S. Armor Association on Armor’s birthday, 12 December 1962.

There was some correspondence after the contest about the winners being professional engineers and had a government contract pending on the device. It was decided that any further contests would have two categories for winners, professional and amateur. Because of the expansive time and efforts required by the magazine and association staff, it was doubtful there would ever be another tank design contest.

By 1964 the U.S. commitments to the conflict in Vietnam gained more interest in the magazine readership. Membership in the Association began to increase. By 1966, the Army established a study group to ascertain if tanks and cavalry units would be of significant value if deployed to Vietnam. The MACOB study resulted in its deployment of the 11th Armored Cavalry

Regiment and several tank units to Vietnam. The magazine articles and news of note still remained mostly oriented towards the European Theater.

In early 1971 some agency reported to the Office of the Secretary of Defense that many professional military associations were staffed by active duty military personnel and had been for decades. In April of 1973, the OSD decreed that in 12 months, there would be no active duty personnel on professional associations' staffs. To continue to publish Armor Magazine would spell financial disaster for the Armor Association. It could not afford to pay an editor, assistant editor, business manager, and circulation manager; not for very long anyway. The executive council decided to give Armor Magazine to the Armor School and move the association to Radcliff.* The president of the association, four star General James Polk did not think the magazine or the association could survive the Fort Knox environment but there did not seem to be any other course. He said he wanted very dedicated people involved in the venture. General Don Starry, who had been a member of the executive council, was scheduled to take command of Fort Knox in July or August. Starry told Polk that he would back the Association 100%.

LTC Burton S. Boudinot was nominated and selected to be the new Secretary Treasurer of the Armor Association and Editor in Chief of Armor Magazine. At the time Boudinot was also Chief of Armor testing at the Armor and Engineer Board at Fort Knox.

*The editor often published articles that were controversial or not in accord with the Armor School thinking. This had been a problem for years.

In June 1973 Boudinot flew to Washington D.C. for an interview with General Polk and discuss the move with editor Bob Kelso. General Polk informed Boudinot that he must be prepared to fall on his sword to save the magazine and the association. He was angry because the president of the Association of the United States Army wanted to absorb the Armor Association and its journal as it was doing with the Artillery Association and its journal. The Cavalry (Armor) Association was the oldest professional military association in the U.S. Army.

The Association had once been located in a nice commercial section of Washington D.C.. Fifty years had taken its toll. In 1973, it was located above a Go-Go Bar and adult book store. Rent and utilities were expensive and parking fees for the staff were very high. It was time to move out of Washington. Bob Kelso was a peddler 1st class. He sold cavalry hats, spurs, ties, and blazers and so on all over the world. In 1972, he made \$31,000 selling stuff and General Polk was concerned about the IRS because we were supposed to be a non-profit organization. Bob had left the magazine preparation to Sergeant C. Frank Daily, and it showed. Sergeant Daily did not have the professional knowledge to be given such a task. When Boudinot looked around the office, he saw an old toll top desk, oak chairs, glass fronted book cases, and boxes of old printing plates. All of this dating back to the late 1800s. In one room was stored what was called the "U.S. Cavalry Library". Boudinot made no mention of how important all these things were to the history of the Association. After he got back to Fort Knox, he was not informed that the Armor School had told Kelso that it would only pay to ship those items that pertained to publishing a magazine. When the truck arrived at Fort Knox, it was found that Kelso had sold most of the furniture and the War College Library had ram sacked the books. Of the 1400 books, only 400 arrived at Fort Knox. Boudinot assumed that Kelso knew the historical value of things. The Armor Association had the funds for shipping.

No one had found a place at Fort Knox to put the magazine. Joann Patton suggested to her husband General Patton that Boudinot be offered the recently vacated retarded children's school. It had been located in a small brick house that once served as a billeting office for the Wary Housing Project after WWII. The retarded children's school had been relocated to Pierce Elementary. The General told Boudinot to take a look at it. The little house was clear across post from the Armor School. It needed new roofing, repairs and inside and outside painting. Boudinot told General Patton he liked it, but he wanted one room turned into a photo lab. He wanted central air conditioning and carpet. The post engineers said it would take until October or November before renovations would be complete. They also said they did not have enough money to do everything. Somebody found \$25,000.00 in "Combat Development" funds that was left over from supporting the Main Battle Tank Task Force which had been disbanded. \$10,000.00 was transferred to the post engineers to help with the renovations.

The lease was up in Washington on the 1st of August, which meant Boudinot had to move the magazine and association in July. He needed a temporary location. On the 6th of July he was given one half of the downstairs of the old Weapons Department building. It was condemned and scheduled to be torn down in the spring of 1974. It was dirty and hot in the place, but Boudinot would have to make it do. The place had to be cleaned up a bit before the truck arrived. The School S-4 got him a detail of five prisoners for a week and he worked their tails off, but they had fun. It was ready in six days. Boudinot called Kelso and told him to roll them out. July 1st the United States Armor Association with no fanfare arrived at their new temporary home. General Starry had not yet taken command of Fort Knox. Because the magazine was not in the current budget, the logistical people did not want to give Boudinot anything. It was like a bastard child coming home. He had to beg, borrow, and steal paper, pencils. Toilet paper, etc. He did not want

the association to buy anything for the magazine right from the start. The magazine had to become a part of the Armor School to survive. The office was so hot Boudinot rented three window air conditioners. They were a big help. During his first week as post commander General Starry called Boudinot and asked what was needed. Boudinot told him he needed a clerk typist and access to the art department at the print plant. In a short time he received a temporary typist and an artist was appointed to help. The staff was late with the July-August issue of the magazine, but it did not have to drop an issue. Armor was a pretty magazine. It had 120 pound litho paper on the inside with a separate three or four color cover. Boudinot had a feeling that the bureaucrats in the Army would try to degrade the cosmetic value of the magazine—he was right. Every year He went through a ritual of cost cutting. In September, he was assigned two young information specialists who were excess on post.

Over the months he went to the little house at least twice a week. It seemed like the contractor was always behind for one reason or another. The cold came early in 1973 and the old weapons buildings furnace had been removed. Boudinot rented three electric heaters; they were a help, but they kept blowing fuses and he worried that the building might burn down. Finally, on the 14th of November, 1973, Armor moved into its new office, which Boudinot call the “John Lannon House”. Sergeant John Lannon was the cavalryman that Remington sketched in 1900. The sketch became the symbol of the US Cavalry Association and became known as “Old Bill”.

By the 1st of January, 1974, Boudinot had four months before the association staff had to be civilianized. He needed two people, a business manager and a circulation manager for the association. Unfortunately, he could only afford to pay a business manager \$8,000.00 a year and \$3.00 an hour for a part time circulation manager. Boudinot interviewed five people for the business manager position and they laughed at him; he interviewed three for the other. Women

wanted paid sick time and vacation time. Things were not looking very bright. He wondered often whether the association was doomed. One day his wife told him she would help out with circulation until somebody came along. Mrs. Boudinot was a detail person, meticulous with paperwork. He knew she could do it. The files were a mess and it was going to be hard work. She came on board in March.

Boudinot had known Major Chuck Griffiths from PTA. He retired in 1970 and went to work in security with the Treasury Department. In 1974, he was a security guard at the Gold Vault. His family had a horse at the stables also and our wives and children got to know each other.

One day Mrs. Griffiths was talking to Mrs. Boudinot and was telling her how much Chuck disliked his work at the Gold Vault and that now that he had his accounting certificate from Elizabethtown Community College, maybe he could get a better job. When Boudinot called Griffiths and asked him to come and talk. He explained to him that his pay would get better every year if he could do the job and planned to ask the executive council to raise the pay accordingly. At first Griffiths said no and went home. He called Boudinot one evening and said he would give it a try.

Lt. Stangle assigned to the magazine staff, spent his last week in the Army bringing Chuck Griffiths up to speed.

After Boudinot retired, Chuck Griffiths went on to become "Mr. Armor Association" and after sixteen years of faithful service died in December 1990 while still trying to do his job. He was making \$28,000.00 a year.

Clarence Pratt, the president of the Fort Knox National Bank, had a computer program developed for membership and mailing lists; all at a very reasonable cost. Mrs. Boudinot worked

hard to input all the data into the program. It was tedious work and she would get upset when the transition was not going smoothly. She introduced a 50 years membership certificate. These people were made exempt from dues. Boudinot introduced a large author's certificate with a four color association crest on it. Both were suitable for framing. Mrs. Boudinot was replaced by the summer of 1974.

Mr. Eaton came to visit Boudinot. He was trying to determine how much the Army should charge the Armor Association for rent and utilities. Boudinot had put the association upstairs. It was not big, but enough room for two people. It had its own telephone number and post office box. When Mr. Eaton implied that Boudinot was breaking regulations, Boudinot told him to tell his boss to call General Starry. Boudinot never heard from him again. To this day (2008), the magazine and association are still co-located.

On April 1, 1974 the preparation and publication of the Armor Magazine was turned over to the Armor School. The magazine and association had a new home, like it or not. A new logo was introduced; "ARMOR" in block letter.

Relationship with the Armor School and Center staff improved as time passed, thanks mainly to General Starry. The little house, the magazine's and association's new home was dedicated in a ceremony at the "John Lannon House" with its bronze plaque and new paint job.

In 1975, at the Armor Association Banquet, Col. Boudinot introduced historical firearms as drawing prizes. Drawing became so popular that after 32 years it was still a coveted event at the banquet.

On August 1, 1977 Col. Boudinot retired leaving the magazine and association in good hands.

General Polk's prediction in 1973 that the magazine and association would not survive at Fort Knox did not come to pass thanks to General Starry, General Dave Doyle, Beau Williams and others.

It was suggested that the magazine editor position should be civilianized. The Armor Association felt that an active duty Armor Officer would be more current in armor affairs. With its up and downs the Armor School published the magazine and the association bought copies for its member.

In the early 1980's the business manager of the association, Charles Griffiths, received the title of Secretary/Treasurer from the editor of the magazine to further separate the two responsibilities. The editor became the National Director of the association.

In 1984 General Starry began talking to the executive council about a St. George award for the Armor and Cavalry people. The Artillery had been awarding a St. Barbara Medal for almost one hundred years. St. George was the patron saint of the Knights and later the Horse Cavalry (St. George was the dragon killer).

In 1986 the Order of the Saint George Medallion became a reality. It was awarded on three levels, Bronze, Silver and Gold. (Qualifications for each are on file) Over the years the Order of the Saint George, in spite of a few glitches, became a very successful and coveted award.

The Order of Saint George was well received by the Armor Community. In a couple of years the Bronze had become a "Good Conduct Medal" which General Starry had expected. The Silver became an Officer's retirement medal and the Gold became an "Order of General Officer's Medal".

By 1992 commanders of units and general officers were awarding the Bronze to persons not qualified to receive it. One general officer presented a Silver to a visiting German General as a “token”. The Association’s National Director (Editor of Armor Magazine), the custodian of the Saint George eligibilities for awards should not have let this develop.

The problem was brought before the Association’s Executive Council. It was decided that a “Noble Patron of Armor” should be created for civilian and military personnel with a long standing support of the Armor Community. This was well received and became a coveted award. A “Gold Noble Patron” was established by the association president in 2000. A “Saint Joan” award with medal was established at the same time as the “Noble Patron Award” and was also well received.

Over the years the Silver became a very coveted award which was the intent in its establishment. The Gold has been well received, but unfortunately many old tank and Cavalry soldiers have never been recommended for the award. Most of the recipients of the “Gold Order of Saint George” (40+ by 2008) have been General Officers.

During 1990 Charles Griffiths, the business manager, became ill and in December 1990 died. His assistant Ms. Connie Bright became the Secretary/Treasurer of the association under the Editor in Chief, LTC Pat J. Cooney, who was then the National Director.

Around 1990 it was suggested that the Armor Magazine and the Association be moved from the little “Lannan House” as a result of a decision to level the housing area including the Lannan House. Nothing happened at this time.

In 2000 the building m1109 , a historical barracks was renovated. Built in the 1930’s it was the billets of the 1st Cavalry Regiment (Mechanized) and later housed the famous Armor and Engineer Board. Upon completion of the renovation the magazine and association were moved

from the little house to the third floor of building 1109. The office area was well laid out and spacious. Armor Magazine had a new home, like it or not.

The U.S. Cavalry Association later renamed the U.S. Armor Association is the oldest professional military organization in the U.S. Army Since its founding in 1885 its membership has reported for over 120 years the experiences and far reaching thoughts of horse cavalrymen, armored and air cavalrymen, tankers and associated industrial engineers in its coveted journal. Its membership, both foreign and domestic has provided comprehensive documentation of the hardships of war, the courage, the valor and lessons learned from the officers and non-commissioned officers of the most powerful land fighting force in the history of warfare we know it as “The Combat Arm of Decision” ARMOR.