

ENLISTED GRADE STRUCTURE AND THE ARMY REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1920

BY BENJAMIN FRANKLIN COOLING III*

THE search for some type of optimum grade structure for the United States Army has greatly concerned personnel planners in the Department of the Army in recent years. But in a sense the issue is as old as the American army itself with certain problems forming something of a unifying thread throughout the history of enlisted grades in the Army. One such problem is that of the distinction, for pay and prestige purposes, between the noncommissioned officer who exercises command authority "in the line" and the skilled technician who performs certain technical or administrative duties. Other problems are the impact of technological change upon organization and collaterally upon grade structure, and the effect of the "individual man" upon the rank which he holds at any given time with respect to both his grade and his job. These problems became particularly acute at the end of World War I, and attempts to find solutions are a more

or less forgotten aspect of the Army's reorganization in 1920.

The history of the Reorganization Act of June 4, 1920, has received much attention.¹ Scholars have examined intently such matters as the General Staff, universal military training, civilian components, aviation and other branches, as well as the broader aspects of field organization and military policy. But they have not dealt with those sections of the legislation that standardized enlisted grades, ratings, and pay despite their growing importance as the century has progressed and as technology has developed pervasively in the Army as elsewhere. They are perhaps even more important in the 1960's than at the time of the postwar reorganization of 1920.

The United States Army emerged from World War I with over forty "grades" of enlisted men rather haphazardly lumped into seven categories in Army Regulations.² (See Table 1.) Whereas there had been some fifty-

TABLE 1
ORDER OF RANK ARMY NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS, 1917

<i>Categories</i>	<i>Rank and Title</i>
1-11.	Commissioned officers
12. (a)	Sergeant Major, Regimental; Sergeant Major, Senior Grade, Coast Art.
(b)	Quartermaster Sergeant, Senior Grade, QMC; Master Hospital Sergeant, Medical Dept.; Master Engineer, Senior Grade, Engineers; Master Electrician, Coast Art.; Master Signal Electrician; Band leader
(c)	Hospital Sergeant, Medical Dept.; Master Engineer, Junior Grade, Engineers; Engineer, Coast Art.
13.	Ordnance Sergeant; Quartermaster Sergeant, QMC; Supply Sergeant, Regimental
14.	Sergeant Major, Squad. and Bn.; Sergeant Major, Junior Grade, Coast Art.; Supply Sergeant, Bn., Engineers

* The author is a historian with the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.

15. (a) First Sergeant
- (b) Sergeant, First Class, Med. Dept.; Sergeant, First Class, QMC; Sergeant, First Class, Engineers; Sergeant, First Class, Signal; Electrician Sergeant, First Class, Coast Art.; Electrician Sergeant, Art. Detach. USMA; Asst. Engineer, Coast Art.
- (c) Master Gunner, Coast Art; Master Gunner, Art. Detach. USMA; Band Sergeant and Asst. Leader, USMA Band; Asst. Band Leader; Sergeant Bugler; Electrician Sergeant, Second Class, Coast Art.; Electrician Sergeant, Second Class, Art. Detach. USMA; Radio Sergeant
16. Color Sergeant
17. Sergeant; Supply Sergeant, Company; Mess Sergeant; Stable Sergeant; Fireman, Coast Art.
18. Corporal

Source: Army Regulations, April 15, 1917, Art. III, Sec. 9.

seven ratings of enlisted specialists recognized in the Army (including combat types), by 1919 the total had swelled to 704. The structure which had been slowly expanding, in reality ever since the eighteenth century, had literally mushroomed under the impetus of a rapid mobilization and participation in World War I. War Department planners were simply unable to systematize the grades. It was to be the task of the planners of the postwar army to try to bring some order out of the chaos.

The period 1919-1920 is exceedingly confusing in terms of just where the final seven-grade scheme of the 1920 Act really originated. This is due to the numerous reorganization, pay, and policy studies and legislation

which were examined both by the War Department and the Sixty-sixth Congress. What is obvious is that the initial piece of proposed legislation, the "official" War Department, or "Baker-March," bill, which was introduced in Congress on January 16, 1919, did not contain any regularization of the confusing grade structure. Its proposals merely perpetuated the wide divergency of pay for various noncommissioned officer and enlisted specialist ranks.⁸

The lack of popular and Congressional support for the War Department Bill, because of aversion to a large peacetime army among other things, led both houses of Congress to drop consideration of that bill entirely. Each of the two military committees on Capitol Hill proceeded to prepare a bill of its own. Now, for the first time the idea of a more orderly enlisted grade structure received legislative attention.

From the available records it seems that both Congressional committees and War Department planners decided in the late spring and summer of 1919 to relieve the existing confusion. The decision was not reached altogether independently by the committees or the

¹ See modern accounts such as: Bernard L. Boylan, "Army Reorganization 1920: The Legislative Story," *Mid-America: An Historical Review*, XL (April 1967), 115-128; Edward M. Coffman, *The Hilt of the Sword: The Career of Peyton C. March* (Madison, 1966), chaps. xiv and xv; Forrest C. Pogue, *George C. Marshall: Education of a General* (New York, 1963), pp. 213-215; John McAuley Palmer, *America in Arms: The Experience of the United States with Military Organization* (New Haven, 1941), chap. xviii; Paul Y. Hammond, *Organizing For Defense: The American Military Establishment in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, 1961), pp. 46 ff.; Russel F. Weigley, *Towards an American Army: Military Thought From Washington to Marshall* (New York, 1962), chap. xiii; and John M. Dickinson, *The Building of an Army: A Detailed Account of Legislation, Administration, and Opinion in the United States, 1915-1920* (New York, 1922), chap. ix.

² Cong. Rec., 66th Cong., 2d sess. (1919-1920), LIX (Pt. 2), 7187.

⁸ Memo, Director, War Plans Division (WPD) to Chief of Staff (CofS), May 22, 1919, Sub: Bill for the Reorganization of the Army, CofS File 50/54, RG 165, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C. Hereinafter only the appropriate files of RG 165 will be cited. See also "Pay of the Army" table in *Official Army Register*, Dec. 1, 1918, p. 1138.

War Department, however, for the latter had liaison officers working with the committees. It undoubtedly occurred to realists in both the committees and the Department, but most especially to cost-conscious Congressmen, that the confusion and chaos in the pay structure could not continue indefinitely.

From the Congressional standpoint there were a number of factors that influenced the legislators in their preparation of postwar military policy. They wondered how to reward enlisted men who had served with distinction overseas. They sought to solve the problem of former enlisted men who had served as wartime officers but who had reverted to enlisted status upon the return of peace. In addition, Congressional planners were concerned with what to do about warrant officer grades created during the war in the Army Mine Planter Service and the anomaly of Army and Quartermaster field clerks who had served in a capacity that was neither that of a commissioned officer nor of an enlisted man.⁴

There were, on the other hand, relatively fewer people in the War Department who were especially concerned with the plight of the wartime enlisted men. However, elements of the War Plans Division of the General Staff, the Finance Service, and apparently the Chief of Staff himself, General Peyton C. March, were interested in equalizing the rates of pay of specialists, improving the administrative, clerical, and stenographic work of the Army, especially in the field, and creating incentives for retention of qualified veteran enlisted men, as well as in the questions of warrant officers and field clerks.⁵

Early in 1920 General March requested a

⁴ AGO, Policy and Historical Branch, "Outline History of the Rank and Grade of Warrant Officer, Army of the United States," Feb. 1, 1943, (Unpub. MS, Army Library, Washington, D.C.) pp. 1-5. See also ltr., Secretary of War (SW) to Chmn., Comm. on Mil. Aff., HR, Dec. 27, 1919, CofS 1062/100; ltr., Kahn to Weeks, SW, Apr. 26, 1921, WPD #677.

comprehensive study covering the duties and requirements of specialists in all branches of the service and the equalization of their pay, which the Organization Committee of the War Plans Branch of the General Staff, thereupon conducted. These planners went further, however, than merely the question proposed by General March, for they also sought improvement of the status of noncommissioned officers, their relative pay, and simplification of their grade designations and pay system.⁶ At the same time they made similar studies of warrant officers and field clerks. Together with their findings on enlisted specialists, the planners coordinated this information with such liaison officers as Colonels John McAuley Palmer, Thomas M. Spaulding, and John W. Gulick, who worked closely with the Senate and House military affairs committees.

These committees, meanwhile, had arrived at two separate pieces of legislation for the reorganization of the Army. Senate Bill 3792, sponsored by Senator James W. Wadsworth, Jr. (R-N.Y.), Chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, was in fact a complete reorganization scheme. The House committee bill, HR 12775, sponsored by Representative Julius Kahn, (R-Cal.), only professed to amend certain portions of the National Defense Act of 1916.⁷ While similar in many ways, some of their provisions, includ-

⁵ Memo, Act. Dir., WPD, to Dir. of Ops., Aug. 28, 1919, Sub: Changes in Chevrons, WPD #681; ltr., SW to Chmn., Comm. on Mil. Aff., HR, Dec. 27, 1919, CofS #1062/100; memo, Act. Dir., WPD, to CofS, Feb. 25, 1920, Sub: Army Reorganization Bill, HR Confidential Print (HR 12775, early version), WPD #4119. Finally, see ltr., SW to Chmn., Comm. on Mil. Aff., HR, May 19, 1920, WPD #4863-2.

⁶ Annual Report of Division of War Plans, General Staff, 1920, pp. 9-10, WPD #6018.

⁷ Memo, Chief, Leg. Rules Br., to Dir., WPD, May ? 1920, Sub: Warrant Officers, rated men and their pay, WPD #5496; Cong. Rec. 66 Cong. 2d Sess. (1919-1920), LIX (Pt. 7), 7331-32. John McAuley Palmer in his Notes on WPD Plan of April 1, 1919, prepared July 17, 1942 (Palmer Papers, Box 10, Lib. of Cong.), indicated the differences between the two bills.

ing those sections dealing with warrant officers, enlisted grades and pay, required alignment.

Senator Wadsworth's bill originally envisioned some 750 warrant officers inclusive of those in the Mine Planting Service of the Coast Artillery Corps. Pay and allowances for this category were to be equated with those of a second lieutenant. Band leaders were to have the rank, pay, and allowances of warrant officers, but there was no provision in the Senate committee version for the future appointment of warrant officers.

The Senate committee bill provided for eight enlisted grades as follows:

Grade	Percentage of Total Authorized EM Strength	Monthly Pay
Master Sergeants	1.0%	\$100
Technical Sergeants	1.4%	\$75
First Sergeants	1.6%	\$75
Staff Sergeants	3.0%	\$60
Sergeants	6.0%	\$50
Corporals	14.0%	\$40
Privates 1st Class	25.0%	\$30
Privates	48.0%	\$25

In addition, all enlisted men would receive 10 percent of the initial pay of their grade for each five years of service not to exceed a total increase of 40 percent. The bill also provided for a class of specialists, in line with War Plans Division studies. There would be six ratings in this class with extra monthly pay for the various specialties. Finally, certain additional pay incentives would be awarded in the Coast Artillery, Air Corps, and Signal Corps for technical proficiency.⁸

The House committee bill included several significant differences. There would be a total of 1,575 warrant officers in addition to those

authorized by existing regulations for the Mine Planter Service. The pay would be \$1,320 per year with only the allowances of a second lieutenant. In addition, Army band leaders would be commissioned officers and receive the allowances but not the rank of second lieutenants if they had less than six years of service and first lieutenants if they had more. The House also rigidly spelled out that warrant officer appointments would be by promotion of noncommissioned officers with at least ten years enlisted service or of temporary officers and field clerks of the war period where there were openings.

The House bill also provided for a scheme of enlisted grades but with six rather than eight grades as in the Senate bill. These were as follows:

Grade	Percentage of Total Authorized EM Strength	Monthly Pay
1st	2.0%	\$75
2nd	2.0%	\$60
3rd	10.0%	\$50
4th	10.0%	\$40
5th	32.0%	\$33
6th	44.0%	\$30

Provisions for service pay equaled those in the Senate bill, as did provisions for six classes of specialists, but the House bill would concentrate these specialists in the last two grades. Qualification pay for certain enlisted combat classes in addition to technical classes, also marked the House proposals.⁹

On March 18, the House approved HR 12775 and sent it on to the Senate, which did not approve its own reorganization bill, the Wadsworth bill, until the middle of April. The reluctance of either body to accept the other's proposed legislation produced a deadlock. But when the War Department staff reviewed these bills it expressed satisfac-

⁸ Secs. 13 and 14 in S. 3792, Jan. 23, 1920, Lib. of Gen. Staff Col., *Reorganization of the Army 1920: Bills and Reports* (comp. in Lib. Nat. War Col., Wash., D.C.); and memo, Asst. Dir., WPD, to CofS, June 16, 1920, Sub: Grades and Specialist Ratings of Enlisted Men under the Act of June 4, 1920, WPD #6441.

⁹ Sec. 4a, of HR 12775, Feb. 26, 1920, *Reorganization of the Army 1920: Bills and Reports*.

tion with the steps taken on Capitol Hill. There were, however, some reservations as to where to put so many warrant officers (as provided in the House bill) in the postwar Army. Then, too, the Staff desired several minor changes in the distribution of specialists, but in general its sentiments were appropriately summarized by the Chief of the War Plans Branch when he said:

Provisions for warrant officers will not only give the means for solving the problem of making suitable places for reliable and faithful non-commissioned officers but also will dispose of Field Clerks whose status has always been unsatisfactory.

The establishment of grades for enlisted men with uniform rates of pay, and ratings for enlisted specialists will eliminate discontent heretofore existing in the various branches and simplify administration and accounting.¹⁰

With or without the blessings of the War Department the two separate bills, which included much more than the provisions on grade structure, had to be reconciled with one another. The differences, especially on universal military training, presented a difficult problem to the Senate conferees who met with their counterparts in the House in an effort to end the deadlock. But House members such as Representatives Daniel R. Anthony, John C. McKenzie, S. Hubert Dent, and William J. Fields had their own ideas as to the direction of any compromise bill. Then, too, they were not as conversant with the Senate proposals as Chairman Kahn. They felt that the Senate version could never get through the calendar of the House before the close of that session. If Wadsworth could condense the main features of his plan into a few short amendments to the House bill then the House conferees might agree to accept them.¹¹ Certainly the success or failure

turned on provisions other than those sections on enlisted grades and warrant officers, but they were among the conflicts which had to be reconciled.

The conferees found it possible to compromise on the provisions for warrant officers and enlisted grades by initially agreeing to a figure of 1,120 warrant officers, in addition to those already in the Army Mine Planter Service. House conferee desires were followed as to appointment, pay, and allowances, but the Senate managers won out on their desire to have band leaders regarded as warrant officers.

Grade	Percentage of Total Authorized EM Strength	Monthly Pay
1st	0.6%	\$74
2nd	1.8%	\$53
3rd	2.0%	\$45
4th	9.5%	\$45
5th	9.5%	\$37
6th	25.0%	\$35
7th	51.6%	\$30

In line with House desires, however, specialist ratings were to be based upon the number of enlisted men in grades six and seven, as follows:

Specialist Categories	Percentage of Authorized EM's in Grades Six and Seven	Monthly Pay
First Class	0.7%	\$25
Second Class	1.4%	\$20
Third Class	1.9%	\$15
Fourth Class	4.7%	\$12
Fifth Class	5.0%	\$ 8
Sixth Class	15.2%	\$ 3

The conference bill included pay incentives based on previous service but did not include any provisions for marksmanship or other proficiency qualifications.¹²

¹⁰ Memo, Chief, War Plans Branch, for Dir., WPD, June 2, 1920, Sub: Resume of Army Reorganization Bill, WPD #6166.

¹¹ Palmer, *America in Arms*, pp. 181-182; and Cong. Rec., LIX (Pt. 8), 7833.

¹² See Conf. Rept. to accompany HR 12775, 66th Cong., 2d Sess., House Report 1049, in *Reorganization of the Army 1920: Bills and Reports*; and Cong. Rec., LIX (Pt. 8), 7833.

The debate on the reorganization bill that came out of the conference was long and heated. Senator Wadsworth appropriately summarized the rationale behind the conferees' actions as to warrant officers and enlisted grades when he told his Senate colleagues:

Today, as the result of years of legislation, it is astounding what a fearfully complicated machine we have in the Regular Army, particularly in the matter of enlisted grades. We have 49 grades of enlisted men today. That number has been piled up through the years by little special acts adding a sergeant here, a quartermaster sergeant there, a technical sergeant in some other place, all with different ratings, all with different insignia, complicating the pay schedules, complicating the whole administration of the service. This bill, by consolidating these different noncommissioned grades reduces from 49 down to 7 and simplifies the whole administration of the service in doing so; and in order to give pay to men who become skillful mechanics, electricians, telephone operators, and telegraph operators, we establish a series of specialist ratings, where the man instead of being given a noncommissioned rank or grade is given a little extra pay to reward him for the skill which he has acquired in these mechanical and technical operations. By that we eliminate a large number of noncommissioned officers who should not by rights be wearing chevrons, but are to-day wearing chevrons in order that they may get the pay that goes with the chevrons. We want to wipe those out and give them pay for the work they do, and we call them enlisted specialists, and the ratings are fixed in the bill. There is no difference in the cost one way or the other, but the proposal under our bill is infinitely more simple.¹⁴

Passage of the Reorganization Bill finally hinged on weightier matters than the sections concerned with enlisted grades and warrant officers. But the long-fought-over legislation, in essence the House bill, became Public Law 242, on June 4, 1920. The War Department then set about translating its provisions into

practice.

Only the aviation officials in the War Department continued to have serious reservations about the new pay scale. This was because the Act eliminated retention of extra pay for duty as aviation and balloon mechanics.¹⁴ In general, the pay-grade provisions pleased the War Department General Staff, although some staff officers appeared baffled as to how to eliminate then existing designations for grades without providing appropriate substitutes under the new Act. As Brigadier General Henry Jervey, Director of Operations, expressed it: "To eliminate the present grades which serve to designate qualifications in which men are particularly fitted and to place the men possessed of these varied qualifications in a general class without means of distinguishing one another is bound to lead to confusion."¹⁵

There was apparently little confusion in the minds of War Department planners, however, for they saw but two solutions. Either they could prescribe designations of a more or less arbitrary character with the object only of fixing relative rank and pay, or they could prescribe designations which would describe duties and qualifications. Since the system before June 4, 1920, had been of a hybrid nature and hence unsatisfactory, and had included Sergeant Buglers but never Sergeant Blacksmiths, Sergeant Bakers, Sergeant Painters, etc., it seemed only sensible to the War Plans Division to follow the first alternative. Indeed this was the procedure outlined in the general order issued to the Army on June 19, 1920.¹⁶

The order designated the seven new grades

¹⁴ Memo, Asst. Dir., WPD, to CofS, June 16, 1920, Sub: Grades and Specialist Ratings of Enlisted Men under the Act of June 4, 1920, WPD # 6441.

¹⁵ Memo, Asst. CofS, Dir. of Ops., to Dir., WPD, June 24, 1920, Sub: Grades of Non-Commissioned Officers, WPD #6646.

¹⁶ Memo, Dir., WPD, to Dir. Ops. Div., June 28, 1920, Sub: Grades of Non-Commissioned Officers, *ibid.*; and WD GO 36, June 19, 1920.

¹⁸ Statement by Sen. James Wadsworth, Apr. 5, 1920, *Cong. Rec.*, LIX (Pt. 5), 5189.

prescribed by the Reorganization Act and the old titles that would fall into each of the seven grades. (See Table 2.) The order carried both the House designation of "First Grade," "Second Grade," etc., as well as the Senate designation "Master Sergeant," "Technical Sergeant," and the like. Finally it placed the various categories of pre-1920 specialists into the new structure.

Examination of the procedure set forth in the order shows how truly difficult it was to separate the noncommissioned officers whose primary functions were those of leadership from the noncommissioned officers whose primary functions were those of technicians.

What was really done by the War Department was to separate the noncommissioned leaders from the noncommissioned technicians at the lower levels. The first three grades continued to be loaded with men whose primary functions were technical in nature despite the fact that they usually directed other soldiers in the performance of technical duties. The establishment of the specialist categories within the two grades of privates proved to be just as difficult a task, for the original directive had to be amended some five times in 1920 and twice in 1921 before a lasting version was completed in September 1921. The final listing included some 231

TABLE 2

REARRANGEMENT OF THE NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER STRUCTURE, 1920

<i>New Grade</i>	<i>Old Titles</i>
"First" or Master Sergeant	Regimental Sergeant Majors; Sergeant-Majors, Senior Grade; Quartermaster Sergeants, Senior Grade; Master Hospital Sergeants; Master Engineers, Senior Grade; Master Electricians; Master Signal Electricians; Engineers, CAC; Regimental Supply Sergeants, 25% of Ordnance Sergeants now authorized; 50% of Master Gunners now authorized in CAC; Band Sergeant and Assistant Leader, USMA Band
"Second" or First Sergeant or Technical Sergeant	First Sergeants Technical Sergeants as follows: Hospital Sergeants; Master Engineers, Junior Grade, 75% of Ordnance Sergeants now authorized; Electrician Sergeants, First Class; Assistant Engineers, CAC; Quartermaster Sergeants; Electrician Sergeants, Artillery Detachment, USMA
"Third" or Staff Sergeant	Squadron and Battalion Sergeants Major; Sergeants Major, Junior Grade; Battalion Supply Sergeants; Sergeants, First Class; 50% of Master Gunners now authorized CAC; Master Gunners, Artillery Detachment, USMA; Assistant Band Leaders; Sergeant Buglers; Electrician Sergeants, Second Class; Radio Sergeants; Color Sergeants; Sergeant Field Musician, USMA
"Fourth" or Sergeant	Sergeants as at present authorized in all arms and services except those designated separately as specialists; Company Supply Sergeants; Mess Sergeants; Stable Sergeants; Band Sergeants
"Fifth" or Corporal	Corporals as at present authorized in all arms and services except those designated as specialists; Band Corporals; Corporal Buglers
"Sixth" or Privates, First Class	Privates, First Class, as at present designated Specialists as prescribed
"Seventh" or Private	Privates as at present designated Privates, Second Class Specialists as prescribed

Source: War Department General Orders No. 36, June 19, 1920.

vocational skills which could raise a private's pay anywhere from \$3 to \$25 per month¹⁷

In summary this standardization of enlisted grades provided a viable system for dealing with the problem of ranks and grades in any army that was small by World War I standards but still much larger and more sophisticated than the prewar army had been. The Act of June 4, 1920, provided a solution to the problem along three different lines: (1) by creating the new permanent position of warrant officer for performance of certain administrative and specialist duties; (2) by prescribing seven standard grades into which all enlisted men could be fitted for the purpose of both pay and establishing rank and precedence; and (3) by setting up a large number of specialist positions in the lower grades that carried additional pay without additional rank.

The motives behind Congressional and War Department actions were not altogether uncomplimentary. Congress had wanted to reward faithful enlisted men and temporary officers of the war period. It wished to end the chaotic pay schemes and to improve ad-

ministrative procedures in the Army. The War Department also desired to achieve the latter goals and was not opposed to creation of permanent warrant officers as a sort of "super enlisted grade" to provide incentive and "room at the top." All in all the new system worked out fairly well, and it remained remarkably stable down to the time of World War II. Indeed, its basic elements have continued to influence the grade structure of the United States Army in the years since.

In 1920, however, the Congress and the War Department probably placed relatively little importance upon this particular aspect of the new legislation.¹⁸ It has only been in the post-World War II period that the search for an optimum grade structure has assumed great importance. If in the Army of a rapidly changing world there exists both a need for the technically proficient specialist and the qualified noncommissioned leader (the traditional "backbone of the Army," to quote Rudyard Kipling), how can both be attracted to military careers and for that matter have respect for one another's positions in the military hierarchy? The search, begun perhaps formally for the first time in 1919-1920, promises to be a continuing one.

¹⁷ For detailed changes see WD GO 44, July 20, 1920, sec. 4; WD GO 47, Aug. 10, 1920; WD GO 73, Dec. 13, 1920; WD GO 1, Jan. 8, 1921, sec. 4; and WD GO 49, Sept. 26, 1921. See also AR 615-10, Dec. 13, 1923, which lists 227 skills.

¹⁸ Interview with Colonel Thomas M. Spaulding, USA (Ret.), Apr. 5, 1967, Wash., D.C.

SALUTE TO CONTINGENT IN VIET NAM

IN recent months four members of the American Military Institute are known to have departed for service in Viet Nam. We salute: Lt. Colonel R. J. Buck, who is on his second tour; Commander David Kirchner, our former Director of Membership; Commander C. R. Rowdybush, our Bibliography Editor; and Major David Zook, USAF, who, we deeply regret to announce, is last reported as missing. Any further news of Major Zook, as well as of other AMI members serving will be much appreciated by the Editor of *Military Affairs*, Captain Victor Gondos, Jr., 4201 Massachusetts Ave N.W., Washington, D. C. 20016.



Enlisted Grade Structure and the Army Reorganization Act of 1920

Benjamin Franklin Cooling III

Military Affairs, Vol. 31, No. 4, (Winter, 1967-1968), pp. 187-194.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0026-3931%28196724%2F196824%2931%3A4%3C187%3AEGSATA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>

Military Affairs is currently published by Society for Military History.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/smh.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

<http://www.jstor.org>
Wed Mar 21 15:42:16 2007