

A DECADE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT. (1920-1930)

by

GEORGE BALDRIDGE TELFORD, JR.

B. S., Kansas State College of Agriculture
and Applied Science, 1933

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1934

Spec
Coll
LD
2668
T4
1934
T41

PREFACE

Few extensive studies of the military policy of the United States have been made. Those that have been made have been concerned primarily with the operation of the armed forces during the time of war. The peacetime soldier has been almost wholly ignored. The knowledge of the average person concerning the United States army is therefore very limited.

The author has had the opportunity to gain first hand information of army life from his association with army people. Many of these observations, however, could not be placed in this thesis because of the lack of corroborative documentary evidence. The war department in its correspondence with the author declared that it was unable to furnish certain information that would have been of great value in this study. The reports of the secretary of war sound more like resolutions passed in a convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution than like ordinary state documents. Other government documents relating to military affairs are also lacking in adequate information. From the meagre sources available, an attempt has been made to present the operation and aims in our military policy

which have been so radically changed by the national defense act of 1920. The author has attempted to show what becomes of the money collected in the form of taxes and spent upon the military establishment and to analyze the results so as to ascertain whether the money is spent for an economically sound enterprise that will yield a return on its investment or whether it is used for an unproductive purpose that reduces the purchasing power of the government and thus lowers the standard of living of the people.

The library and librarians at Kansas State College have been of great aid in the preparation of this thesis. Credit for assistance in the preparation of this work is also due Dr. Fred A. Shannon, associate professor of history and government at Kansas State College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF 1920.....	1
II. MILITARY EXPENSES AND THE STANDING ARMY.....	19
III. LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.....	35
IV. THE CITIZENS' ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.....	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	66

I. THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF 1920

Before 1920 the United States government had no definite military policy. In each war the nation had depended largely upon inexperienced volunteers for defense. These men would be given an intensive short period of training before being sent to the battle field. The army was reorganized by an act passed in 1916. This, however, was only a temporary measure, enacted to meet an emergency. A new policy was started with the passage of the national defense act of 1920. The significance of the statute from the standpoint of one connected with the United States army was later stated by Secretary of War Dwight Filley Davis.

The National Defense Act of 1920 is, without question, the first real military policy ever enacted for this country. The carrying out of its provisions in the full, it is confidently believed, will insure the safety of this Nation against aggression. Carried into effect as originally passed, it will serve to save immense amounts of treasure in future years, and more vital than such financial savings, it will result in the sparing of bloodshed and the saving of lives should war again loom upon us.¹

It is important for the understanding of the national defense act to study the conditions under which it was

¹Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1925, p. 11.

passed. Also, it is of interest to consider the original contents of the bill as reported by the senate committee. The government was beginning to demobilize the army after the World War at a time when military hysteria was still prevalent. The less military minded members of Congress raised a storm of protest when the Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported the bill with a section calling for universal compulsory military training. This section reads as follows:

All male citizens of the United States, (excluding residents of Alaska and the insular possessions) and all male persons who reside therein and who have declared their intention to become citizens, other than persons excepted by this act, shall, upon attaining the age of 18 years, or within 3 years thereafter, be subject to military or naval training, and shall be inducted into the army or navy of the United States for this purpose alone, and shall be subject to training therein for a period of four months and for such further time, not exceeding 10 days, as may be reasonably necessary for enrollment, mobilization, and demobilization.²

The conscription feature of the bill was reported favorably by both the Senate and House committees.³

Although the real writing had been done by the general staff and the conscription feature had been strongly endorsed by the secretary of war, Newton Diehl Baker, and by President

²Congressional Record, 66 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2, 637.

³Senate Report No. 400, 66 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1.

Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic minorities of both houses combined with Republican insurgents to defeat it. Kenneth McKellar, senator from Tennessee, submitted a minority report urging that the section calling for universal compulsory training be eliminated. He opposed James W. Wadsworth, senator from New York, in debate on the floor of the senate. Senator Wadsworth declared that "the question for congress to decide now is whether in further emergencies the young men of America shall go into battle with a decent chance for their lives." Those opposed to the majority report argued that such a bill would create a military spirit throughout the nation.⁴

The newspapers, with few exceptions, made strong pleas for universal training. Such large dailies as the Chicago Tribune, New York Evening Sun, and the New York Times attempted to array public opinion on the side of universal training, but with little success.⁵ In an editorial in the New York Times the opponents of universal military training were severely denounced. A portion of the editorial read as follows:

⁴"The A. B. C. of Universal Training," in World's Work, Vol. XXXIX (April, 1920), pp. 537-538. Also, Congressional Record, 66 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 2637-2643.

⁵"To Raise All Our Boys to Be Soldiers," in Literary Digest, Vol. LXII (August 23, 1919), p. 14.

But the pacifists, the pro-Germans, the radical labor men and the Bolsheviki, and, it must be admitted, a mercenary and calculating class that does not want to lose the services of the young men during even a brief period of military training were opposed to the system proposed in the Senate Army bill.⁶

Senator McKellar in one of his speeches against universal training stated that, "If this system [universal compulsory training] is put in force, in 12 years it will cost more than the United States has paid out for the German War. Exclusive of what we loaned the allies, the war has cost us about \$18,000,000,000.....It is the most audacious and expensive military proposal in all history."⁷

Another departure from our traditional military policy was the proposal for a citizen's army. By this term is meant an army of organized reserves who undergo periodical training and are subject to call at any time in case of emergency. The senate military committee had in mind a progressive development of this type of national defense. Commencing with the year 1921, plans were made to begin with an army of 850,000 men and to increase gradually the size until 1926, when the number should reach the total of 3,129,000. These figures are exclusive of those persons

⁶New York Times, April 12, 1920.

⁷Congressional Record, 66 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2641.

who would be compelled to take training under the proposed universal training provision.⁸ Estimates of the war department for maintaining the army of the United States on this basis between the years 1921 to 1926 ranged from 645 to 700 million dollars yearly. The estimates of the senate committee were approximately 100 million dollars less.⁹

The national defense act, encountering little opposition after universal compulsory training was eliminated, became law on June 4, 1920. The nature of the statute is set forth in its title, "An Act to Amend an Act entitled 'An Act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice." Although the act is called an amendment it is really a completely rewritten bill. It is the foundation upon which the national defense of the United States is now based. The reference to military justice in the title is to the "Articles of War" or the military code which defines criminal offenses and their punishment and also prescribes the procedure of court martial.

The forces that constitute the army of the United

⁸Senate Report No. 400, 66 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 7.

⁹Ibid.

States are the regular army, the organized reserves, including the officers' reserve training corps and the enlisted reserve corps. The uninformed individual usually thinks of "the army" as referring to the regular army. This, however, is technically incorrect. It is proper to say that anyone who is compelled by the government at any time to wear a soldier's uniform is a member of the United States army.¹⁰

The combatant arms--more commonly called the line of the army--is made up of the infantry, cavalry, field artillery, corps of engineers, and the signal corps. The other units of the regular army are the corps of the general staff and the quartermaster, the departments of the adjutant general, inspector general, judge advocate general, finance, medicine, and ordnance, the chemical warfare service, the officers of the bureau of insular affairs and of enlisted men under the jurisdiction of the militia bureau, chaplains, professors and cadets of the United States Military Academy, and the military store keeper. Also, detached officers and enlisted men, unassigned recruits, Indian scouts and retired officers and enlisted men are separate units of the army. It can readily be seen how easy it would be to expand such an organization should the need arise.¹¹

¹⁰Statutes at Large, Vol. XLI, p. 759.

¹¹Ibid.

As provided in the national defense act, the reserve officers' training corps is the very foundation of the citizen's army. Before 1920 the corps had been confined to institutions of higher education, but by this act the war department is authorized to place a unit in any school which meets certain requirements. Although in theory there is no compulsory military training in the United States, the element of constraint can still be exercised to a great degree by local school authorities. A good understanding of the importance of the reserve officers' training corps can best be obtained by referring to the statute.

The President is hereby authorized to establish and maintain in civil educational institutions a reserve officers' training corps, one or more units in number, which shall consist of a senior division organized at universities and colleges granting degrees, including State universities and those State institutions that are required to provide instructions in military tactics under the Act of Congress of July 2, 1862, [Morrill Act] donating lands for the establishment of colleges, where the leading object shall be practical instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts, including military tactics, and at those essentially military schools not conferring academic degrees, specially designed by the Secretary of War as qualified, and a junior division organized at all other public and private educational institutions, and each division shall consist of units of the several arms, corps, or services in such number and such strength as the President may prescribe: Provided, That no such unit shall be established or maintained at any institution until an officer of the Regular Army shall have been detailed as professor of military science and tactics, nor until such institution shall maintain under military instruction at least one hundred

physically fit male students, except that in the case of units other than infantry, cavalry or artillery, the minimum number shall be fifty.

Provided further, That except at state institutions described in this section, no unit shall be established or maintained in an educational institution until the authorities of the same agree to establish and maintain a two years' elective or compulsory course of military training as a minimum for its physically fit male students, which course when entered upon by any student, shall, as regards such student, be a prerequisite for graduation unless he is relieved of this obligation by the secretary of war.¹²

The scope of military training in the schools is thus greatly enlarged over that under the Morrill Act of 1862. It should be noticed also that the war department's jurisdiction enters not only the institutions of higher learning but also those of secondary education. The training given in the latter reaches boys of the most impressionable age of from 14 to 18 years. This provision has never been carried out to the extent originally planned. Congress has seen fit to limit the number of reserve officers' training corps units in high schools by refusing to appropriate the funds necessary for the carrying on of such work except in the larger schools. A school with an army officer on the faculty has two administrators, the local school authorities and the war department. As far as the military division is concerned, the war department's word is final.

¹²Ibid., pp. 776-777.

Summer camps are provided for those who take the advance course in the reserve officers' training corps. Each cadet must attend camp and undergo training for a period not to exceed six weeks in any one year. While at camp the student receives the pay of a soldier of the seventh grade, which is \$21.00 a month, the lowest pay that any soldier receives. Board is furnished free and traveling expenses are paid to and from camp at the rate of five cents a mile. The reserve officers' training corps is the chief source of officers for the reserve officers' corps. When the student graduates from the senior course, if he is twenty-one years of age, he has the privilege of becoming a reserve officer. He can not resign his commission for a period of five years from date of appointment. If the student is under twenty-one at the completion of his course, he is given a certificate of eligibility which enables him to become a reserve officer when he reaches the age of maturity.¹³

Unlike the reserve officers' training corps the national guardsman owes allegiance both to the governor of the state under whom he serves and to the President of the United States. In case of war the President may immediately

¹³Ibid., p. 778.

draft the guard into the regular army. Members of this branch of the service are paid while undergoing training on the same basis as the regular army.¹⁴ The secretary of war is given the power also to establish citizen's military training camps for the purpose of giving instruction to civilians.¹⁵

Except in time of war or other emergency the number of enlisted men in the regular army shall not exceed 280,000.¹⁶ The war department and army officers, interpreting this section of the national defense act to mean that the regular army should be kept at its maximum strength, conducted an intensive recruiting campaign for the purpose of enlisting and maintaining the full quota. In the appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1921, congress expressed its desire for a regular army of 175,000 and appropriated money to meet the requirements of such a force. However, the secretary of war, Newton D. Baker, disregarding the desires of congress in his endeavor to build the army up to its maximum strength, created a deficit of approximately \$100,000,000.¹⁷ It took a joint resolution to make Baker stop recruiting so the army would stay within its appropriations.¹⁸

¹⁴Ibid., p. 784.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 779.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 1,507.

¹⁷House Report No. 1,264, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 1.

¹⁸House Report No. 1,168, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 1.

With the exception of the medical and veterinary divisions, the promotion of officers in the regular army depends almost wholly upon seniority. The secretary of war has a promotion list, and the officer with the longest term of service is at its head. Promotions are made as vacancies occur. If for any reason there is a sudden increase in the size of the army, promotions proceed much faster. Otherwise junior officers must wait for their seniors to either die or retire in order to reach a higher rank. The exception is in the case of doctors of medicine, dentistry, and of veterinary surgery. A dentist or physician is given the rank of first lieutenant upon entering the service. In three years he is promoted to the rank of captain, after 12 years to the grade of major, in 20 years he becomes a lieutenant colonel, and after 26 years of service a colonel. The promotion system for the officers of the veterinary medical corps is slightly different. A doctor of veterinary medicine goes into the army as a second lieutenant instead of as a first lieutenant. After three years of service he is promoted to first lieutenant, in seven years he becomes a captain, in 14 years a major, in 20 a lieutenant colonel, and after 26 years a colonel.¹⁹

¹⁹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XLI, p. 771.

Promotion of the enlisted man is entirely ignored in the national defense act. Provision for his promotion is made by regulations of the war department and is almost wholly based upon the recommendation of the company's commander.

The salaries of officers and men in the United States army are characterized by a very high scale among the upper grades and a very low one in all but the highest grade of enlisted men. The national defense act carried a pay schedule but was supplanted by a more detailed system, written into the act by an amendment passed in 1922. Three things were considered in the pay schedule of officers: rank, length of service, and whether or not the officer has dependents. The following is the very complicated pay schedule of officers. By "annual base pay" is meant the salary that the officer receives without the special allowances that are allotted to him.²⁰

²⁰Official Army Register for 1933, pp. 1,328-1,329.

PAY OF OFFICERS IN ACTIVE SERVICE
Act of June 10, 1922

Grade	Pay period	Annual base pay	Monthly Rates											Rental Allowances and Subsistence Allowances (30-day month)				Limitation on pay and allowances			
			Initial monthly pay under conditions stated	Over 3 years' service	Over 6 years' service	Over 9 years' service	Over 12 years' service	Over 15 years' service	Over 18 years' service	Over 21 years' service	Over 24 years' service	Over 27 years' service	Over 30 years' service	With dependents		No dependents					
														Rental	Subsistence (30 days)	Rental	Subsistence (30 days)				
General. Chief of Staff.....	8000	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	108	31.20	72	15.60	808.33
Major general.....	8000	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	666.67	108	31.20	72	15.60	808.33
Brigadier general.....	6000	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	108	31.20	72	15.60	625.00
Colonel:																					
Over 26 years' service.....	6 4000	466.67	483.33	500.00	108	31.20	72	15.60	600.00	600.00		
First appointment above captain Appointed under sec. 24,	6 4000	333.33	350.00	366.67	383.33	400.00	416.67	433.33	450.00	466.67	483.33	500.00	500.00	108	31.20	72	15.60	600.00	600.00		
Act June 4 1920.....	6 4000	333.33	350.00	366.67	383.33	400.00	416.67	433.33	450.00	466.67	483.33	500.00	500.00	108	31.20	72	15.60	600.00	600.00		
Less than 26 years' service....	5 3500	291.67	306.25	320.83	335.42	350.00	364.58	379.17	393.75	408.33	108	46.80	72	15.60		
Lieutenant colonel:																					
Over 30 years' service.....	6 4000	479.17	479.17	500.00	108	31.20	72	15.60	600.00	600.00		
Over 20, less than 30 years....	5 3500	379.17	108	46.80	72	15.60		
First appointment above captain Appointed under sec. 24,	5 3500	291.67	306.25	320.83	335.42	350.00	364.58	379.17	393.75	408.33	422.92	108	46.80	72	15.60		
Act June 4, 1920.....	5 3500	291.67	306.25	320.83	335.42	350.00	364.58	379.17	393.75	408.33	422.92	108	46.80	72	15.60		
Less than 20 years' service....	4 3000	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	90	46.80	54	15.60		
Major:																					
Over 23 years' service.....	5 3500	393.75	408.33	422.92	437.50	108	46.80	72	15.60	600.00	600.00	
Over 14, less than 23 years....	4 3000	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	90	46.80	54	15.60		
First appointment above second lieutenant.....	4 3000	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	90	46.80	54	15.60		
Appointed to Regular Army to Regular Army to fill vacancies created by increase of com- missioned personnel thereof in 1920 (Act May 23, 1928).....	4 3000	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	90	46.80	54	15.60		
Less than 14 years' service....	3 2400	200.00	210.00	220.00	230.00	240.00	72	31.20	54	15.60		
Captain:																					
Over 17 years' service.....	4 3000	312.50	325.00	337.50	350.00	362.50	375.00	...	90	46.80	54	15.60		
Over 7, less than 17 years....	3 2400	220.00	230.00	240.00	250.00	72	31.20	54	15.60		
First appointment above Sec.Lt. Present rank July 1, 1920, or earlier.....	3 2400	200.00	210.00	220.00	230.00	240.00	250.00	72	31.20	54	15.60		
Less than 7 years' service....	2 2000	166.67	175.00	183.33	54	31.20	36	15.60		
First Lieutenant:																					
Over 10 years' service.....	3 2400	230.00	240.00	250.00	260.00	270.00	280.00	290.00	300.00	...	72	31.20	54	15.60		
First appointment above Sec.Lt.	2 2000	166.67	175.00	183.33	191.67	54	31.20	36	15.60		
Over 3, less than 10 years....	2 2000	175.00	175.00	183.33	191.67	54	31.20	36	15.60		
Less than 3 years' service....	1 1500	125.00	36	15.60	36	15.60		
Second Lieutenant:																					
Over 5 years' service.....	2 2000	175.00	...	183.33	191.67	200.00	208.83	216.67	225.00	233.33	241.67	250.00	...	54	31.20	36	15.60		
Less than 5 years' service....	1 1500	125.00	131.25	36	15.60	36	15.60		

Although the salaries of army officers are very high, these men are continually complaining that they are under paid. General James G. Harbord stated that army officers were "not so well paid as some branches of skilled labor nor so liberally remunerated as many position in civil life above the grade of laborer which demand less of education and character than does the army."²¹

The retirement pay of army officers is almost as generous as that while on duty. No allowances are given retired officers except for those with the title of "General of the Armies of the United States." It is customary for an officer to reach the rank of major before retirement. Enlisted men are retired after thirty years of service while officers retire when they reach the age of 62 if they so desire. Any previous retirement is due to the disability of the individual. The following tabulations are the retirement pay of officers and enlisted men and also the pay of enlisted men on active duty.²²

²¹James G. Harbord, "Army as a Career," in Atlantic Monthly, Vol. CXXXII (September, 1923), p. 335.

²²Army Register, 1933, pp. 1,330-1,335.

MONTHLY RATES OF PAY OF ENLISTED MEN UNDER ACT OF JUNE 10, 1922

	Less than 4 years' service	Over 4 years' service	Over 8 years' service	Over 12 years' service	Over 16 years' service	Over 20 years' service
First Grade [Master sergeant].....	\$126.00	\$132.30	\$138.60	\$144.90	\$151.20	\$157.50
Second Grade [First or technical sergeant]	84.00	88.20	92.40	96.60	100.80	105.00
Third Grade [Staff sergeant].....	72.00	75.60	79.20	82.80	86.40	90.00
Fourth Grade [Sergeant].....	54.00	56.70	59.40	62.10	64.80	67.50
Fifth Grade [Corporal].....	42.00	44.10	46.20	48.30	50.40	52.50
Sixth Grade [Private, first-class].....	30.00	31.50	33.00	34.50	36.00	37.50
Sixth Grade with rating as specialist:						
First class (\$30).....	60.00	61.50	63.00	64.50	66.00	67.50
Second class (\$25).....	55.00	56.50	58.00	59.50	61.00	62.50
Third class (\$20).....	50.00	51.50	53.00	54.50	56.00	57.50
Fourth class (\$15).....	45.00	46.50	48.00	49.50	51.00	52.50
Fifth class (\$6).....	36.00	37.50	39.00	40.50	42.00	43.50
Sixth class (\$3).....	33.00	34.50	36.00	37.50	39.00	40.50
Seventh Grade [Private].....	21.00	22.05	23.10	24.15	25.20	26.25
Seventh Grade with rating as specialist:						
First class (\$30).....	51.00	52.05	53.10	54.15	55.20	56.25
Second class (\$25).....	46.00	47.05	48.10	49.15	50.20	51.25
Third class (\$20).....	41.00	42.05	43.10	44.15	45.20	46.25
Fourth class (\$15).....	36.00	37.05	38.10	39.15	40.20	41.25
Fifth class (\$6).....	27.00	28.05	29.10	30.15	31.20	32.25
Sixth class (\$3).....	24.00	25.05	26.10	27.15	28.20	29.25

MONTHLY PAY OF RETIRED ENLISTED MEN, INCLUDING \$15.75 AS COMMUTATION OF QUARTERS,
 FUEL, LIGHT, CLOTHING, AND RATIONS AT RATES IN EFFECT AFTER JUNE 30, 1922

Grade	12 years	16 years	20 years
Grade 1 -- Master sergeant.....	\$124.42	\$129.15	\$133.87
Grade 2 -- First or technical sergeant.....	88.20	91.35	94.50
Grade 3 -- Staff sergeant.....	77.85	80.55	83.25
Grade 4 -- Sergeant.....	62.32	64.35	66.37
Grade 5 -- Corporal.....	51.97	53.55	55.12
Grade 6 -- Private, first-class.....	41.62	42.75	43.87
Grade 7 -- Private.....	33.86	34.65	35.44

The national defense act gives the general provisions for the operation of the army, but the details are worked out by the department of war. The operation under the statute between the years 1920 and 1930 will be the subject of succeeding chapters.

II. MILITARY EXPENSES AND THE STANDING ARMY

The standing army is that branch of the military service known in legal terms as the regular army. Ross A. Collins, representative in congress from Mississippi and a member of the house appropriation committee, estimated that in 1930 the war department had on its pay roll 60,000 civilian employees. The reports of the secretary of war do not give the number of civilians employed. Representative Collins admitted that it was impossible to ascertain the exact total.¹ It is certain, however, that the regular army has been unable to maintain military establishments with soldier labor.

It is sometimes difficult to obtain definite and accurate statistical information from the war department. Harry E. Hull, representative from Iowa, complained bitterly

¹Congressional Record, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,157.

of the contradictory information given out by the war department when the house of representatives was considering an appropriation bill. Daniel Read Anthony, Jr., who was considered the foremost authority on military affairs in the house appropriation committee, in replying to Mr. Hull stated, "I advise the gentleman not to base any of his theories upon figures that come from the war department."² At the beginning of the hearing on the army appropriation bill for 1921 the war department told the appropriation committee that the cost of the maintenance of the United States army in Germany after the World War had been paid in full by Germany. Further investigation by the committee found that this was not true.³

After the World War, Secretary Baker endeavored to build the regular army up to its maximum strength as set by the national defense act. Baker took \$780,000 that had been appropriated for the quartermaster corps and transferred it to the recruiting service fund without any authority from congress. Of this sum \$270,000 was spent for advertising in newspapers and \$300,000 in billboard advertising.⁴

²Idem, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., pp. 2,387-2,388.

³Ibid., p. 2,388. This occurrence was related by Representative Daniel Read Anthony, Jr., of the house appropriation committee.

⁴Ibid., p. 2,519. Also, House Report No. 1,264, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 1.

A clear understanding of the military policy of the United States between the years 1920 and 1930 can best be obtained by observing the appropriation bills of those years. In 1920 the United States had not yet demobilized the forces which had served during the World War. Expenditures for the war department called for the spending of \$1,268,322,269. The house committee on appropriations, disregarding the desires of the war department, reduced the appropriation to \$718,654,591, which was later raised to \$888,703,848.50 by the senate committee. This sum was expected to support an army of 4,000,000 men. Money appropriated for the army is distributed among about 17 items. This classification varies little from year to year. The items and their share of the appropriations for the year 1920 are as follows:

Contingencies of the Army...	\$1,000,000.00
General Staff.....	609,000.00
Field Artillery.....	10,000.00
Adjutant General Department.	12,000.00
Chief of Coast Artillery....	28,000.00
Signal Corps.....	3,650,000.00
Air Service.....	55,000,000.00
Pay of Army.....	215,885,978.50
Quartermaster Corps.....	523,991,620.00

Storage and Shipping.....	\$45,000,000.00
Medical Department.....	5,430,000.00
Bureau of Insular Affairs...	1,000.00
Engineer Department.....	6,002,600.00
Ordnance Department.....	19,662,000.00
National Guard.....	12,215,250.00
Civilian Training.....	200,300.00
International Aircraft	
Standards Commission.....	<u>6,000.00</u>
Total.....	\$888,703,848.50

The item, "Contingencies of the Army," is a reserve fund from which the war department may draw for unforeseen expenses that may arise.⁵

In 1921 there was a very wide difference in the estimates of the department of war and the figures finally decided upon by congress. The secretary of war wanted a regular army of 576,000 officers and enlisted men, calling for an outlay of \$982,800,020. The house committee, whose recommendation was adopted, asked for \$377,246,944 and an army of 175,000 enlisted men.⁶ The reductions were made over the protest of General John J. Pershing, chief of staff. Pershing declared that it would be "unsafe" to

⁵Senate Report No. 24, 66 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 1-3.

⁶House Report No. 821, 66 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1.

reduce the army below 200,000 men.⁷

An interesting feature in the appropriation bill for 1922 was an item of \$1,200,000 for vocational training of enlisted men.⁸ Representative Thomas U. Sisson of Mississippi charged that the entrance of the war department into the field of education would create "Prussianism" among the American people. He declared that:

Prussianism was never able to grow until it made the German people realize that the boy was being educated at the expense of the government.Here is going to be the trouble, under the pretense of educating the boy as the Pope said about children, 'You give me the training of the child until he is 10 years of age and I do not care who has the child after that, I will make him a Catholic!'.....if you take a young man and put him into the army for three years and let him associate with other soldiers, the result will be the same.

Vocational training in the army met with such opposition that it was shortly discontinued.

In 1922 the war department asked for an appropriation of \$699,275,502.93.¹⁰ Congress, however, saw fit to reduce the expenditure of the army to \$386,824,212.41, which allowed for an army of approximately 150,000 including 13,000 officers.¹¹

⁷New York Times, May 16, 1921.

⁸Statutes at Large, Vol. XLII, p. 85.

⁹Congressional Record, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 2,393.

¹⁰House Report No. 1,264, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 3.

¹¹House Report No. 791, 67 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2.

The appropriation act of 1923 carried in the same bill for the first time the "nonmilitary" expenses of the war department. These so-called "nonmilitary" activities of the war department which in the bill received \$68,899,023 of the total sum of \$330,074,738.74, consists of such undertakings as the improvements of rivers and harbors and the maintenance of homes for old soldiers.¹²

In 1924 congress slightly increased the expenditures of the war department, appropriating \$342,449,261 which was sufficient for a standing army of 125,000 men and 12,000 officers.¹³ Reductions were made in the next two years, the appropriations being \$337,683,273 in 1925¹⁴ and \$332,616,631 in 1926.¹⁵ Increases were made each year beginning in 1927 until the expenditures of the war department reached \$454,089,362 in 1930. This sum was an increase of over \$100,000,000 beyond the low point reached in 1926.

The military policy of the United States since the World War was well stated in the house appropriation committee report in 1924:

Never in the history of this country has it had so great a military strength in time of peace

¹²Ibid.

¹³House Report No. 288, 68 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 2-4.

¹⁴House Report No. 1,071, 68 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2.

¹⁵House Report No. 197, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 2.

as it has today. Never before has the country possessed so many military resources in trained men and material. Our regular army has doubled the number of highly trained commissioned officers that it had before the World War, and an enlisted strength 25 percent greater than before the war. The National Guard is nearly 100 percent larger than it was before the war, and a far greater military asset to the nation than ever before.

Supplementary to these active forces are 69,000 men in the Reserve Officer's Corps, a portion of whom are given training each year, and 110,000 young men in the schools and colleges of the country are receiving military training and instruction in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, under direction of the war department, and during the current year [1923] 22,000 civilians underwent military training at camps under the direction of the war department, and this bill provides for the military training of over 30,000 civilians the next fiscal year.¹⁶

The chief mission of the regular army as stated by the secretary of war is to "defend the country against its foes until the citizen components can be mobilized for battle, to garrison our foreign possessions and to train civilian components."¹⁷ The general staff has attempted to keep a force of about 14,000 men in Hawaii and the same number in Panama. According to Representative Anthony these two garrisons have been as great an expense to maintain as the entire army of the United States in the years immediately following the Spanish American War.¹⁸ In 1903 we had a

¹⁶House Report No. 1,397, 67 Cong., 4 Sess., p. 7.

¹⁷Annual Report of the Secretary of War for 1925, p. 1.

¹⁸Congressional Record, 67 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 3,863.

regular army of 59,181¹⁹ men with an annual expenditure of \$70,141,622.71.²⁰ These figures may be compared with a standing army of 135,000²¹ and an annual expenditure on strictly military affairs of \$268,974,050.09 for the year 1925.²² President Herbert Hoover stated on July 23, 1929, that "the American people should understand that current expenditure on strictly military activities of the army and navy constitutes the largest military budget of any nation in the world today...."²³

Any attempt to decrease the size or expenditures of the army has been met by powerful resistance on the part of army officers and so-called patriotic organizations. The "Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States" in its convention in 1929 passed a resolution asking for a larger air corps without any reduction in other branches of the army. A part of the resolution was that copies of their manifesto should be sent to the President of the United States, the secretary of war, and to each member of the committees on military affairs of the United States senate and

¹⁹Annual Report of the Secretary of War for 1903, p. 2.

²⁰Ibid., p. 40.

²¹Annual Report of the Secretary of War for 1925, p. 119.

²²Ibid., p. 53.

²³Congressional Record, 71 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,388.

house of representatives.²⁴ Miss Mary G. Kilbreth of Baltimore, in 1922, presented to the senate committee on military affairs resolutions passed by the Women's Constitutional League of Maryland and the Massachusetts Public Interest League, also a woman's organization. These resolutions urged Congress to maintain the army at its present authorized strength of 150,000 men. Miss Kilbreth said that much of the women's opposition to the army is "sinister" and that some of their organizations are "bringing dangerous women here from Europe to further their plans. It is not their purpose to save money for the taxpayers but to divert the funds into bureaucratic channels to further the policies of Lenin and Trotzky." Also, she declared that the "peace pleas" of a conference of women at Baltimore are "Bolshevist in principle, and is an attempt to undermine the national defense of the United States."²⁵

In 1922, when the house appropriation committee proposed to reduce the regular army to 115,000 enlisted men and 11,000 officers, General John J. Pershing declared that such a proposal would wreck the entire national defense act.

²⁴Proceedings of the Twelfth Triennial Convention of the Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, pp. 62-63, 1929.

²⁵New York Times, April 25, 1922.

He stated further that "the fibre of the regular army has been thoroughly tested by the strains placed upon it, not only in time of war, but in time of peace when it has had to withstand the onslaughts made upon it in the name of economy or pacifism."²⁶

Those who oppose the policies of the military leaders of the United States are severely condemned by army officers. For instance, General Amos A. Fries urged the removal of the Secretary of the National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers' Association from her position on account of her membership in the National Council for the Prevention of War. The general declared that the "insidious pacifist" is "more to be feared than the man with torch, gun, or sword."²⁷

Committees to influence legislation are often formed by army officers. The following announcement appeared in the Infantry Journal: "A legislative committee to deal with reserve appropriations and with other matters of interest to be brought before congress has recently been appointed by Brigadier General John Ross Delafield, presi-

²⁶ Ibid., March 15, 1922.

²⁷ "Discrediting the Army," in New Republic, Vol. XXXIV (April 18, 1923), p. 204.

dent of the Reserve Officers' Association. This committee is made up of members from all nine corps areas, but in view of the nature of the problem involved, most of the members are from the east."²⁸

Captain Floyd Newman of the Reserve Officers' Association stated that every reserve officer should be a member of the Association because "only by being a member can he hope to obtain congressional legislation which will insure him of being adequately trained to fulfill the office vested in him by his commission."²⁹ In addition to the activities of these organizations there are about 1,000 regular army officers stationed in Washington.³⁰ These officers, no doubt, by their presence exert an influence upon legislation.

Not only are the pacifist groups opposed by active and alert military organizations, but army authorities are careful that every criticism of the service from among its own ranks is quickly suppressed. This is made possible by Article 96 of the Articles of War (the military law code)

²⁸"Reserve Officers' Legislative Committee," in Infantry Journal, Vol. XXVIII (January, 1926), p. 109.

²⁹Congressional Record, 71 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,390. This statement of Newman's is quoted by Representative Collins.

³⁰Idem, 66 Cong., 3 Sess., p. 2,389. This figure is an estimate of Representative Anthony of House Appropriation Committee.

which because of its general nature can cover almost any situation which displeases high army officials. The law reads as follows:

Article 96, General Article. Though not mentioned in these articles, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service, and all crimes or offenses not capital, of which persons subject to military law may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general or special or summary court-martial, according to the nature and degree of the offense, and³¹ punished at the discretion of such court.

How this statute can operate to curtail one's freedom of speech in the army is shown by the case of Major Malcolm Wheeler-Nicholson. Major Wheeler-Nicholson had publicly stated that the regular army had been devised for the mentality of the European conscript. After the major had made eleven attempts to see the president, the secretary of war, and General Harbord with no success he gave to the New York Times for publication a letter he had sent to President Warren G. Harding and from which he had received no reply. After the World War congress was called upon to eliminate the oversupply of officers which had been created by war time conditions. An attempted solution was formulated by delegating to the general staff the power to put the least

³¹Statutes at Large, Vol. XLI, p. 806.

efficient officers in class B. Any officer so delegated was to be discharged from the army. It was in protest to the action of the general staff that Major Wheeler-Nicholson wrote. His letter to the president reads as follows:

A veritable reign of terror exists among the junior officers of the army today. This is caused by the unhindered power of the clique [General] Staff to have any officer discharged from the service by operation of what is known as the class B law.....

Prussianism and inefficiency flourish in the army because men rise to power by favoritism instead of efficiency. Classmates and friends are appointed to lead instead of the most efficient men for the job.³²

The letter drew severe condemnation from the secretary of war, John W. Weeks, who said that it violated the custom of the service and that such action would not be tolerated in any "well-managed and successful business institution."³³ A court-martial was ordered to try the major. The charges were (1) absence without leave from post, (2) of having made a false statement in an application for leave, and (3) of writing to the President directly instead of through military channels.³⁴

Major Wheeler-Nicholson was found guilty of violating

³²New York Times, February 5, 1922.

³³Ibid., February 26, 1922.

³⁴Ibid., June 4, 1922.

the 96th article of war and was sentenced to a reduction of "50 files," which means that fifty officers are placed ahead of him on the promotion list. The outcome of the trial was considered a victory for the major in that he was not dismissed from the service. He declared that he was tried because he had the courage to think for himself in the army.³⁵

Previous to the trial Major Wheeler-Nicholson was subject to severe persecution. After the sending of the letter to the President, the major was immediately transferred to another army post. Arriving at his new station late at night he went to the quarters of Major E. A. Colby, a close friend. He rang the door bell; but, although the lights were on, no one answered. It was learned afterwards that at the time Colby was in New York, and during his absence a guard had been placed in the house. The suggestion was made by some officers who accompanied Major Wheeler-Nicholson that Major Colby always left a window open at the side of house in case he was locked out, and perhaps entrance could be gained that way. Heeding their advice Major Wheeler-Nicholson went to the side of the house, and just as he placed his head in the window, the guard inside the house shot him. The major was left for an hour without

³⁵Ibid., June 6, 1922.

medical attention and nearly bled to death. The guard said he mistook Wheeler-Nicholson for an intruder, but the major's mother in a statement to the press intimated that the shooting and the whole affair were not accidental. The real cause of the persecution of the major was said to have originated in 1917, when Wheeler-Nicholson refused to bring false charges against an old sergeant near retiring age.³⁶

However justifiable the charges of Wheeler-Nicholson and others that the officers of the United States army are guilty of inefficiency, there is much evidence to support the contention that the government has encouraged such inefficiency by being over indulgent and lenient. Congress has the habit of passing special bills for the purpose of reimbursing someone for a claim against the government. In one of these special acts is an item concerning Major Delbert Ansmus of the coast artillery corps. Nine years before, in 1920, the sum of \$853.60 of government money which had been entrusted to the major was stolen by an unknown person. At the time of the theft the major had been compelled to stand the loss from his own personal funds. In 1929 a forgiving government, by a special act of congress,

³⁶Ibid., February 6, 1922.

reimbursed the major with the taxpayers' money. Lieutenant William A. Bailey was allowed \$936.16 under identical circumstances. Then there is an item in the same act appropriating \$334.75 to Major F. J. Torney of the quartermaster corps. It seems that the major had become enthusiastic and spent an equivalent amount of his own money in the interest of the army music school, so the government for some reason reimbursed him with a like sum. Perhaps the most startling item in the whole bill is an appropriation to Lieutenant John H. Hall. In 1918 Hall lost \$200 of government funds while crossing the Aquadulce River in Panama. The lieutenant had to pay the \$200 out of his own account. Then, eleven years afterwards, the government relieved him of all liability and reimbursed him.³⁷

Representative Martin Barnaby Madden, chairman of the house committee on appropriations, stated that the secretary of war had appeared before the committee when open hearings had been held on an army appropriation bill and requested that an item of \$27,000 be included in the bill to make up a deficit. When inquiry was made as to the cause of the shortage, it was revealed that a military attache had signed a check on government funds entrusted to his care to pay his

³⁷

Statutes at Large, Vol. XLV, pp. 2,332-2,363.

gambling losses to the amount stated. Representative Madden asked the war secretary if the guilty one was in prison and was told that he had been tried by court-martial but had not been convicted. The committee refused to consider the request so long as the offender was at liberty.³⁸

III. LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

In speaking of the life in an army camp it is necessary to describe two very distinct social groups, namely, the officers and the enlisted men. Since the World War, officers have made up a larger percent of the army than ever before. On November 30, 1927, there were 11,903 commissioned officers and 109,353 enlisted men in the regular army, making a ratio of about one officer to every ten men.¹ These two groups never met on an equality.

Officers and their families maintain a very high standard of living in the army. This is made possible by their large income and by the exploitation of the enlisted man. Almost every officer of the army not on detached duty has detailed to his home at least one soldier whose duty it is to scrub and sweep floors, make beds, and even to do

³⁸New York Times, December 23, 1925.

¹House Report No. 1,753, 69 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 5.

such household duties as cooking and washing dishes. The negro privates especially draw the latter assignments. These soldiers assigned to duty as domestic servants are known in official language as "orderlies," a term seldom used. They are known in army slang as "dog-robbers" or "strikers." Lieutenants generally have one, while officers above that rank almost invariably have at least one. When the rank of colonel is reached, they usually have two. These domestics receive their regular pay from the government and a gratuity from the officer for whom they are working. The tip from lieutenants is usually \$5 a month and from other officers \$10. In addition to these soldier servants, officers' families feel obliged to hire maids. The lieutenants are usually the exception, since most of them feel that their income is inadequate to support a maid. But the higher ranking officers, particularly the colonels and generals, may have two or three. Manual labor by an officer or his wife is considered to be beneath their station in life and, therefore, degrading.²

Army women for lack of other outlets for their energies give brilliant parties, which, because of their

²This information was obtained by the author while he worked as an interior decorator in the homes of officers at Fort Riley, Kansas.

frequency, have assumed a semiofficial nature.³ As in civilian life brilliant entertaining is often more valuable than merit as a means of promotion. It has been said that one's social standing is the criterion by which one rises or falls in the service, and that intelligence, morals, and character are all overlooked if one is a good entertainer.⁴ The American Mercury tells the story of a wife of an officer who divorced her husband while he was away on foreign duty, but neglected to inform him of that fact. Shortly afterwards the divorcee married a naval officer. When the army officer returned he inquired what had become of his wife; but because his ex-spouse had become very popular with her home-brew parties, no one offered to help him solve the mystery.⁵ Liquor is in great demand around the army. Some army officers do not hesitate to break the laws of the country they have sworn to defend. Soldiers stationed at Plattsburg Barracks in 1923 testified before the federal court at Schenectady, New York, that they had several times transported liquor from Canada for officers stationed at the barracks.⁶ Another incident of the same character occurred

³Mary Peyton, "The Army Woman in Fort Benning," in Infantry Journal, Vol. XXXII (June, 1928), pp. 585-587.

⁴M. B. Watts, "Service Wife," in American Mercury, Vol. XXV (February, 1932), pp. 160-166.

⁵Ibid.

⁶New York Times, September 13, 1923.

at Camp Dix, New Jersey, where bootleggers drove their trucks into the camp and exchanged their liquor for stolen army supplies which they transported away by the truck load.⁷

The army clings to its traditions with leech-like tenacity. Although modern science has almost eliminated the horse from industry, his place in the army is as firmly established as ever. This is true notwithstanding the fact that cavalry units in the World War were of no practical value except for guarding prisoners. The chief of cavalry, in a statement to the press, protested against any reduction of the cavalry unit. He gave the following reasons why this division of the army should not be reduced: "No other agency subsists so easily off the country, no other permits such freedom of individual action. No other soldier is aided in his functions by airplanes, tanks, and armored motor cars to a greater extent than is the cavalry soldier during open warfare conditions."⁸

Army officers always expect the government to furnish military establishments with the best of equipment. Horses are no exception to this rule, the army having some of the finest horses in the country. No expense is spared to secure the best animals. For instance, the appropriation

⁷Ibid., April 6, 1922.

⁸Ibid., April 17, 1921.

bill for 1923 allowed \$180,000 for the purchase of animals for breeding purposes and \$150,000 for the encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the army. A further expenditure of \$25,000 was made for the purchase of remounts.⁹ In 1927 the army owned 26,000 horses and 17,000 mules, or a total of about one animal to every three men in the regular army.¹⁰

Polo is the chief outdoor game of the officers. It is played by almost all officers in the cavalry, but is by no means confined to this branch of the army. In civilian life polo is a very fashionable game, because only the rich can afford to play. This may be the reason for its popularity in the army. Congress has attempted to protect the government funds by inserting into the appropriation bills a prohibition against the purchase of polo ponies with government money. An exception is made in that such mounts may be bought for the military academy at West Point.¹¹

As officers are permitted to own their own horses it is sometimes difficult to determine whether the ponies used in polo games belong to the government or to the individual. According to the figures presented by Representative Henry

⁹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XLII, p. 731.

¹⁰ House Report, No. 1,753, 69 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 6.

¹¹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XLIV, p. 263. Also, Statutes at Large, Vol. 42, pp. 1,391-1,392.

Ellsworth Barbour of the house appropriation committee, there were in 1929 a total of 2,548 horses owned by 1,856 officers. Provision is made that officers below the grade of major who own one horse shall receive because of that fact \$150 per annum. If the officer owns two, he receives \$200. These horses are foraged and stabled by the government.¹²

It is common knowledge, however, that educational institutions where cavalry units of the reserve officer's training corps are stationed, use government ponies for polo in direct violation of the law. The following news item appeared in the February 25, 1929, issue of the New York Evening World and was reprinted in the Congressional Record:

The Oregon State mallet swingers are allotted two ponies, regular army horses, which are used in riding classes. Their original cost would average \$166. They are cared for by enlisted soldiers, so there is no additional expense for grooming. The saddles and harness are regular army issue. So the polo mallets are about the only expense.¹³

Likewise in the regular army the government furnishes most of the equipment used in polo, so little expense accrues to the officer who plays the game. The horse thus adds to the aristocracy of the army. However, the useful-

¹² Congressional Record, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,149.

¹³ Idem, 71 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,394.

ness of the horse does not end with polo. Every day around army posts one can see wives of officers attired in "smart" riding suits mounted on beautiful horses. There is much truth to the statement of Representative Ross A. Collins that "the horse is kept in the army because of its amusement and social value rather than its probable military usefulness."¹⁴

The life of the enlisted man in the United States army is usually unpleasant to persons of fine sensibilities. Ambitious and intelligent young men are not content to live a life where there is little chance of promotion and where discipline destroys all initiative. Monotony, constant repetition of the same fact, unending similarity, and likeness in experience, labor, and environment become the chief factors in the soldier's life as soon as the novelty of the situation wears off. This makes the single great aim--the one great ambition of the soldier in camp--to escape the weight of an uncontrollable self-subordination which destroys all difference and all individuality.¹⁵

The chief pastime of the common soldier is gambling. Although poker is played by many, the far most popular game

¹⁴ Idem, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,159.

¹⁵ See Frank Tannenbaum, "The Moral Devastation of War," in The Dial, Vol. LXVI (April 5, 1919), p. 333.

is the shooting of dice. Of course, there are a few soldiers who engage in neither of these games. Soldiers are paid on either the first or last day of each month at about eleven o'clock in the morning. Immediately the dice game begins and runs through the afternoon and far into the night until all the money is in the hands of a few individuals. A few enlisted men, because of their great skill at the various games of chance, have become relatively wealthy.¹⁶

Although the health of soldiers is carefully watched and the food served is excellent, there is much dissatisfaction, as is borne out by the large number of desertions. The army slang term for desertion is "going over the hill." There is a \$50 reward for the capture or information leading to the capture of a deserter. Few, however, are returned.¹⁷ In 1926, 13,000 men deserted from the army, which amounted to about ten percent of the entire personnel.¹⁸ This is about an average number although the total varies with the business cycle, there being more desertions in periods of prosperity.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 334-335.

¹⁷ "Over the Hill," in Infantry Journal, Vol. XXXII (February, 1928), pp. 150-155.

¹⁸ Congressional Record, 69 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,716.

IV. THE CITIZENS' ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

By a citizens' army is meant an army of organized reserves who have undergone military training and are subject to call by the government at any time. This army consists of the national guard, reserve officers' corps, reserve officers' training corps, and the citizens' military training camps. Though the national guard and the reserve officers' training corps were in existence before the World War, the magnified idea of a citizens' army in the United States is a post war creation.

The citizens' military training camps, first authorized by the national defense act of June 3, 1916, were discontinued during the war and were not resumed until 1920. In 1924, for the first time, the number enrolled at the camps exceeded 30,000. The highest enrollment for any year was in 1925, when 38,000 boys attended camp. Since 1924, however, the enrollment has always exceeded 30,000.¹ The annual expenditure of these camps has usually exceeded \$2,000,000.² The popularity of the idea of a summer

¹Robert C. Davis, "Good Citizenship the Aims of Citizens' Military Training Camps," in School Life, Vol. X (April, 1925), pp. 141-143.

²House Report No. 1,991, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2.

vacation with all expenses paid by the United States government is attested by the fact that between the years 1921 and 1924 inclusive, 160,391 applications to attend camp were received, while funds were available for the training of only 90,624.³

The benefits to be derived from the citizens' military training camps have been stated by Robert C. Davis, adjutant general of the United States army, as follows:

The purpose of these camps is to bring together young men from all sections of the country on a common basis of equality, under the most favorable conditions of outdoor life, and through thoughtful behavior, physical development, athletic excellence, and mass training to benefit them individually, while affording them a better understanding of the position they occupy as citizens in the team play of the nation.⁴

Training at the camps is divided into three divisions, the red, white, and blue. The red is the basic course for beginners. On the completion of the white course the student is considered capable of becoming a noncommissioned officer in the United States army, and upon finishing the blue course the student is commissioned a second lieutenant in the reserve officers' corps.⁵ Much emphasis in these courses, aside from the strictly military training, is laid upon the so-called "citizenship training." Each student

³Report of the Secretary of War for 1925, p. 15.

⁴Davis, loc. cit., p. 141.

⁵Regulations for Citizens' Military Training Camps, Special Regulations No. 44b, p. 6.

is given a pamphlet in which is contained readings of American history and government. At the end of each chapter there is a group of questions. The material is studied like a catechism. The following are typical questions:

What do you think of the statement, 'I am not interested in world peace; I am greatly interested in world justice?'

'Justice is always to be desired; peace is not always to be desired.' Discuss.⁶

Some striking statements are found in the pamphlets.

The following discussion concerning the form of government of the United States was contained in the text of the citizenship course.

The United States is a republic, not a democracy.....the philosophy of our government finding its keynote in individualism. Individualism cannot exist in a democracy, because democracy is a government of the masses.....results in mobocracy....the attitude toward property is communistic.⁷

Part of the citizenship training is given in "procurement," a term used to denote training in factory, railroad, and farm management as well as other civilian industrial activities. This work is given in the anticipation that in time of war the government will take over and operate these

⁶United States Army Training Manual, No. 4, p. 35.

⁷Robert Wohlforth, "Catch 'Em Young--Teach 'Em Rough," in New Republic, Vol. LXIV (October 22, 1930), pp. 257-258.

industries.⁸ The charge is also made that members of the citizens' military training camps are taught "to sing the praises of utility companies, status quo, preparedness and 'service' and to chant the horrors of government ownership, socialism, the initiative, referendum and recall, communism, pacifism, and democracy."⁹

The camps have been strongly endorsed by the presidents of the United States since 1920. President Harding even went so far as to send telegrams to all the governors of the states urging them to call attention of the citizens of their respective states to the value of the citizens' military training camps. He stressed the value of the physical and mental development which such training would produce.

Before the World War the national guard was considered to be an exclusive agency of the state government unless called into the service of the United States by the President in case of emergency. By the national defense act of 1920, much more power of supervision was given to the federal government. An idea of the rapid growth of the guard can be obtained by the fact that in 1920 it consisted

⁸ Congressional Record, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2,446.

⁹ Wohlforth, loc., cit., p. 258.

of 1,939 officers and 47,019 enlisted men while seven years later it had 12,010 officers, 182 warrant officers, and 168,750 enlisted men, a total of 180,920.¹⁰ In 1929 the guard had grown to 188,000, involving an annual federal expenditure of \$31,741,601.¹¹

The war department has sought to improve and encourage the use of firearms among civilians. Numerous rifle clubs have been organized, most of them in high schools and colleges. In 1928 the army appropriation bill carried an item calling for an expenditure of \$359,840 for this work.¹² In that year the organization of 1,600 rifle clubs had been completed.¹³

A unique feature in the history of American education has been the role played by the war department. By the terms of the Morrill Act of 1862 federal aid is given to each state for the

...support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the states may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the

¹⁰Congressional Record, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 2,445. The figures are those of Ross A. Collins.

¹¹House Report No. 1,991, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 14.

¹²Ibid.

¹³House Report No. 1,753, 69 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 16.

liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.¹⁴

The provisions of the Morrill Act are repeated in the national defense act of 1920. However, much in addition is added. The relationship of educational institutions, that have a unit of the reserve officers' training corps, with the war department is described in minute detail.¹⁵

In the contract that is signed by the institution and the war department is the provision that the school authorities will use their endeavors to "promote and further the objects for which the training corps is organized."¹⁶

For many years after the passage of the Morrill Act military training in colleges was carried on in a haphazard way. Officers detailed at educational institutions were not given definite instruction as to the aims and purposes of the training. Nor was the content of the course rigidly outlined. This condition was changed by the World War. Thereafter, carefully written text books were used in the class room. The war department has repeatedly maintained that the wording of the Morrill Act made it necessary for

¹⁴United States Compiled Statutes, 1918, p. 1,441.

¹⁵Statutes at Large, Vol. XLI, pp. 776-777.

¹⁶Charles P. Summerall, "Compulsory Military Training in American Colleges," in Current History, Vol. XXIV (April, 1926), pp. 27-34.

each land-grant college to have a two year compulsory military training course for men students. Much of the agitation against the reserve officers' training corps was quieted at the University of Nebraska by army officers telling the students that the \$50,000 a year payment of the federal government to the university would be eliminated if compulsory training was abolished. This is untrue.¹⁷

The first land-grant college to contest the Morrill Act as interpreted by the war department was the University of Wisconsin. In 1923 the state legislature made military training an optional course at the university. The secretary of war brought the case to the attention of the interior department in which the bureau of education is situated. The secretary of the interior ruled that the legislature had acted within the law.¹⁸ This decision was strengthened when a concurring opinion was rendered by the attorney-general in 1930.¹⁹ The significance of these rulings is that a land grant college must offer military training, but

¹⁷ Paul Blanshard, "Military 'Glory' in the Colleges," in The Nation, Vol. CXX (February 18, 1925), pp. 183-184.

¹⁸ Zona Gale, "Don't be Silly," in The Nation, Vol. CXXVIII (April 10, 1929), pp. 422-423.

¹⁹ E. M. Freeman, "R. O. T. C.--A Waster of Youth," in the Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (February 25, 1931), pp. 266-268.

whether it is to be an optional or compulsory course is not within the power of federal authorities to decide. It is evident, however, that if military training is to gain any headway in American educational institutions it must be compulsory in most of the schools. The American youth dislike the restrictions of militarism even though given in "sugar coated" form. The following table shows what happened at the University of Wisconsin after military training was made optional:

The school year 1923-24 was the first year that the military course was an elective.²⁰

Years	Enrollment in military course	Total registration of freshman and sophomore men
1923-1924	1,345	2,442
1924-1925	1,264	2,441
1925-1926	951	2,463
1926-1927	815	2,796
1927-1928	811	3,160
1928-1929	600	2,911

In 1925 military training was given in 226 educational institutions. Of this number, 124 were of college or university rank, 63 were high schools, and 39 are what is

²⁰Gale, loc. cit.

known as military schools. The number of students enrolled in the reserve officers' training corps in 1925 was 125,000.²¹ In addition to these students, there are, according to Representative Ross A. Collins, 59 schools with an enrollment of about 14,000 known as 55-c schools. They do not properly belong to the reserve officers' training corps. The students are given infantry training mostly and are provided with rifles and ammunition. No boy in high school can become a member of the reserve officers' training corps until he has reached the age of fourteen years. Military training is given to Americans at an earlier age than such training is given in any European country.²²

Stationed at the schools maintaining units of the reserve officers' training corps are 768 officers and 1,064 enlisted men. Before 1916 there were no units of the reserve officers' training corps, and only 119 officers were stationed at educational institutions to give military training. The officers who draw assignments with the reserve officers' training corps are the "flower" of the officer personnel of the United States army. They are carefully picked by the secretary of war. Personality and

²¹"Are the Schools Being Militarized?" in Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXVII (December 26, 1925), p. 22.

²²Congressional Record, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,158.

efficiency are the chief factors in their selection.²³

In the larger educational institutions military training seems to be more firmly established than in the smaller ones. Among the greater institutions that offer military training are Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Leland Stanford, and John Hopkins. Some of the larger high schools are Cleveland, Washington, D. C., Chicago, Louisville, Kansas City, Indianapolis, San Francisco, and Salt Lake City. The training is given as an elective in 45 colleges and in 35 high schools. Credit given to the student for such work varies with the school.²⁴

There is little similarity in the uniforms worn by students in different institutions. Most schools require the uniform to be worn only at drill. However, there are some schools, among them Texas Agriculture and Mechanical College, which require the uniform to be worn on all occasions.²⁵

Federal expenditures for the reserve officers' training corps has run close to \$3,000,000 a year since 1920. In the decade from 1920 to 1930 the number of students taking

²³"Are the Schools Being Militarized?" loc. cit.

²⁴Duff Gilford, "Militarist Bait for Students," in New Republic, Vol. LX (October 2, 1929), p. 168.

²⁵William John Cooper, "The Question of Military Instruction," in School Life, Vol. XVII (March, 1932), p. 131.

training has been close to 120,000 annually.²⁶ Between the highly exaggerated claims of the militarists and the fiery denunciations of the pacifists it is difficult to arrive at any conclusion as to the benefit of military training for young men. Dwight F. Davis, secretary of war under Coolidge, stated that in his opinion military training is to be highly valued because of its teaching of "self-respect and self-reliance, in the building of healthy bodies and healthy minds, in the promotion of democracy and broadmindedness, and in the inculcation of verile American citizenship."²⁷ The worth of military training as physical exercise is disputed by Colonel Herman J. Koehler, who was in charge of physical training in officers training camps at the beginning of the World War. According to Koehler the "use of the musket as a means of physical development is, in my opinion, positively injurious. I deny absolutely that military drill contains one worthy feature which cannot be duplicated in every well regulated gymnasium in the country today."²⁸

²⁶House Report, No. 497, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 18.

²⁷"A Debate on Military Training in Schools and Colleges," in School and Society, Vol. XXIV (January 17, 1926), p. 70.

²⁸T. Guthrie Speers, "Educating for War," in Christian Century, Vol. XLVII (November 12, 1930), p. 1,383.

James W. Wadsworth, senator from New York, sent a questionnaire to the presidents of colleges in which units of the reserve officers' training corps were located. Five questions were asked:

1 Is the R. O. T. C. an asset to your institution in the development of your students morally and physically?

2 Does this training contribute something important and unique in the education of your students?

3 Is the influence of the army officers on your students salutary?

4 Is the presence of the army officers essential to secure the best military and educational results from the plan?

5 Do the military formations, the standards set by the training improve the morale of your school?

The college presidents were almost unanimous in answering these questions in the affirmative.²⁹ Of course, consideration must be given to the fact that few of these men would have been heads of institutions that had military training unless they believed in the system. The result of another questionnaire was entirely different. A letter was sent to professors in colleges scattered all over the United States. The question was asked whether they believed

²⁹

New York Times, February 19, 1922.

that the reserve officers' training corps should be retained. Replies were made by 48 of the 166 to which letters were sent. The following are the results:³⁰

- 2 Positively in favor.
- 1 Favor training in junior and senior years only.
- 2 Not opposed.
- 3 Have not definite opinions.
- 1 Very doubtful.
- 1 Considers it as a possible vocational subject.
- 5 Would have no compulsory training.
- 33 Would have no military training.

There is a well organized effort on the part of certain organizations, mainly educational and religious, to destroy the reserve officers' training corps. Among such groups is the Federal Council of Churches, the National Grange, and the National Educational Association, also national representatives of the Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Disciples, Reformed Church, and the society of Jewish women have protested.³¹ The most

³⁰ George A. Coe, "What Do Professors Think of Military Training in High Schools?" in School and Society, Vol. XXVI (August 6, 1927), p. 175.

³¹ "Military Training Losing Ground in Colleges," in Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (January 14, 1931), p. 45.

active group that opposes military training in educational institutions is the organization which calls itself the "Committee on Militarism in Education."

The policy of the war department is to combat the pacifist organization by doing all in its power to popularize the training by giving it to students in "sugar coated" form and then to crush all agitation against the reserve officers' training corps by the use of "strong arm" methods. General Pershing declares that military training in the schools is "popularized by all available methods."³²

Two forms of appeal are especially used: first, to "tone down" the training by removing objectionable features; and, second, the use of sex appeal. An example of the attempt to make the training more pleasant was the discontinuance of bayonet drill in 1926.³³ This was done in spite of the fact that the bayonet is the most valuable weapon the infantryman has in an attack. The following is the statement of the value of the bayonet as given in a reserve officers' training manual:

Training in bayonet fighting has its chief value as a factor in the development of the

³²"Militarized American Youth," in The Nation, Vol. CXXI (December 16, 1925), p. 694.

³³"Sex and the R. O. T. C.," in The Nation, Vol. CXXVIII (May 1, 1929), p. 523.

development of the offensive spirit. Every infantryman must be trained to such a point that he has full confidence in his ability personally to overcome his adversary in hand-to-hand combat.³⁴

Since 1926 all mention of the bayonet has been removed from the training manuals. Officials of the war department probably thought that the training in the use of the bayonet was too realistic.

The harsh army discipline of the regular army is not enforced in the reserve officers' training corps. If cadets make mistakes, they are mildly reminded of the fact. However, the largest step toward popularization of the training is the bringing of girls into the army as honorary officers. Their commissions are authorized by the war department and the candidates are chosen in a popularity contest held by the cadets. The duty of the female officers is to call the attention of the boy undergoing training to the fact that a button may be missing or a grease spot may have appeared on his clothing. Other than for this purpose their value is purely ornamental. In the San Diego, California, high school they have gone a step further and have a corps of matron sponsors as well as pretty girl sponsors to help popularize their military unit. A girl who is chosen an honorary officer is given high compliments and wide

³⁴William E. Persons, Military Science and Tactics (Columbia, Missouri, C. 1921), Vol. I, p. 272.

publicity. "'With so pretty a colonel,' smiled General Summerall, 'it is no wonder the Creighton R. O. T. C. is such a well drilled unit.'"³⁵

The newspapers of the country are loud in their support of military training in the schools. The following are press reports concerning honorary officers, as reprinted in The Nation:

'Nifty colonel! The best-looking colonel in the country,' University of South Dakota students call Miss Eva Jean Leslie. She's honorary colonel of the R. O. T. C. at the university, and in this capacity leads the grand march at the school's annual military ball.

Oh! It's Great to Be a Soldier when the officers are as nice looking as El Delle Johnson, 19 year old Oldsburg, Kansas, girl. Miss Johnson has been made honorary colonel of the Kansas State Agricultural College R. O. T. C.³⁶

Army authorities like to see influential students become officers. Fraternities compete with each other in an effort to get their share of officers. At Northwestern University, when considerable opposition to the reserve officers' training corps developed, the president of the Young Men's Christian Association, who had virtually no military training, was made a captain for the purpose of

³⁵Gilford, loc. cit., p. 170.

³⁶"Sex and the R. O. T. C.," loc. cit., p. 524.

influencing students' opinion.³⁷

In spite of the attempt of the military authorities to popularize the training, the opposition to military training seems to be increasing. This agitation the war department has sought to suppress by every known means. General Charles P. Summerall declares that "it is time that our students and the patriots of our nation know the truth about the pacifist organizations which are attempting to undermine the doctrines upon which the constitution of our country is based."³⁸ In an interview with the press, Secretary of War John W. Weeks stated that

The war department has been cognizant of the fact that the communist program has stressed the desirability of breeding disloyalty among the personnel of the army and navy and citizens at large. It is not intended to assert that all opposition to the military establishment is occasioned by such influence, but undoubtedly many loyal Americans have lent their support to movements which were inspired by radical organizers.³⁹

Military authorities use the word "communist" to describe all liberal organizations and liberal leaders to whom they are opposed. The "Scabbard and Blade," national fraternity of the reserve officers' training corps, published a "blacklist" which contained the names of certain

³⁷Blanshard, loc. cit., pp. 183-184.

³⁸Summerall, loc. cit., p. 28.

³⁹New York Times, April 7, 1922.

persons whom they declared were working "in line with instructions received from the Communist Third International." Among the names on the list were those of Ex-Governor William Sweet of Colorado; Senator George Norris of Nebraska; Zona Gale, journalist; and Jane Addams, social welfare worker. Governor Sweet was condemned for having said the "...the salvation of society depends upon substitution of the cooperative ideals of service for the present creed of profits." Senator Norris was denounced for having favored investigation of a blast at an Illinois steel company's plant. Zona Gale was accused of being a supporter of LaFollette and was said "to stand in with the communist crowd," while Jane Addams was denounced as the most dangerous woman in America. One clergyman was blacklisted for being identified with the Church League for Industrial Democracy.⁴⁰

There have been numerous instances in the United States where authorities of the reserve officers' training corps have by intimidation and threats taken away the individual's right of free speech. Persecution has taken many forms. Three students in the Wankegan, Illinois, high school who were distributing literature of the Young

⁴⁰"Scabbard and Rattle," in New Republic, Vol. L (May 21, 1927), p. 290.

Workers' League were seized and taken before the army instructor of the high school. He told them they would be given a count of five before the reserve officers' corps would be turned loose on them. The count of five was not enough, for the three unfortunate boys were overtaken and beaten.⁴¹

At the University of Oklahoma opponents of military training had arranged a meeting at which the Reverend John Nevin Sayre was scheduled to speak. Colonel George Chase Lewis protested to President William B. Bizzell, and Mr. Sayre was not allowed to speak on the campus.⁴²

A court-martial was ordered for the Reverend Russell H. Stafford, pastor of the First Congregational Church at Minneapolis, Minnesota. Stafford was a first lieutenant and chaplain of the 313th medical regiment of the reserve officers' corps. The charge against Stafford was that he opposed the establishment of a reserve officers' training corps unit in the high schools of Minneapolis.⁴³

At Pennsylvania State College the secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association invited speakers on both

⁴¹Spears, loc. cit., p. 1,384.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³M. H. Hedges, "On Trial: Officers' Reserve Corps," in The Nation, Vol. CXIV (May 24, 1922), p. 616.

sides to address the forum on the case of a student who had been required to withdraw because of refusal to take military training. The president of the college refused to permit such a meeting and requested the secretary to make no further reference to the case in speech or print. The secretary resigned.⁴⁴

The students voted 2,092 to 354 against compulsory military training at the College of the City of New York. The president of the college, Sidney E. Mezes then forbade further agitation of the matter by the student paper, The Campus.⁴⁵ Later, in 1929, Alexander Lifstutz, a senior, and Leo Rothenberg, an underclassman, were suspended from the college for carrying on agitation against the reserve officers' training corps.⁴⁶

The dismissal of Professor Herbert Adolphus Miller, noted sociologist, from the faculty of the Ohio State University has been claimed by many to have been due to his opposition to the reserve officers' training corps at the university. The cause for the dismissal as given by the

⁴⁴"Training for War," in New Republic, Vol. XLV (December 16, 1925), p. 100.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 102.

⁴⁶"Compulsory Military Drill at the College of the City of New York," in School and Society, Vol. XXVI (November 19, 1929), p. 648.

president of the university was that Professor Miller had made a speech in India in which he urged the followers of Gandhi to continue their passive resistance to the British.⁴⁷ The board of trustees, however, issued a statement upon the dismissal of Miller which is evidence that the cause of the dismissal was the sociologist's antimilitaristic attitude. The statement is as follows:

The board feels that the university should not be subjected to emotional criticism because of the unripe vociferations of a small group of students and a very few members of the faculty who were under no compulsion to come here and are under none to remain unless they can subscribe to the fundamental purposes of this university.⁴⁸

At the University of Ohio at Athens, Donald Timberman, student pastor of the Methodist Church, in 1927 stated in public that he did not believe in compulsory military training. Colonel A. M. Shipp, commandant of the reserve officers' training corps at the university, immediately recommended that he be removed from his position as pastor. Investigation was open before a board appointed by the corps area commandant. Only because strong protest was made at Washington against this interference with Timber-

⁴⁷ "The Military Guillotine," in Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (June 3, 1931), p. 732.

⁴⁸ Robert L. Tucker, "Ohio State--Battleground of Freedom," in Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (June 17, 1931), p. 805.

man's freedom of utterance, did the war department finally order that no further action be taken.⁴⁹

At Boston University, Henrietta Perkins, editor of the student paper, The Beanpot, wrote humorous articles in the paper concerning the reserve officers' training corps. These articles were reprinted in the newspapers in Boston. The dean immediately demanded that she resign as editor and threatened to dismiss her from college. He also suppressed the issue of The Beanpot and managed to recall several copies. The following is one of Miss Perkins's stories that was considered so objectionable:

The Rover boys were discussing patriotism and military drill when in walked Captain Strong, who had been peeping through the transom:

'In exactly five minutes by my timepiece,' he announced, 'there will be a lecture on Protecting Our Foreign Markets with Poison Gas, by Major Dumb. This lecture will be purely voluntary, but'--and here his brow was wrinkled with something like a frown--'every one hundred percent American boy will be there or I'll know the reason why!' So saying he resumed his former position at the transom.

'Oh, goody, goody,' cried Tom, just jumping up and down in his excitement.

'Hurrah for poison gas! I hope he'll give us some to play with after class.'⁵⁰

⁴⁹Speers, loc. cit., p. 1,383.

⁵⁰"Henrietta Spills the Beans," in The Nation, Vol. CXX (April 22, 1925), p. 456.

An instance showing the touchiness of the subject, occurred at Kansas State College. Harrison B. Summers, debate coach at the institution had arranged a debate to be broadcast over the college radio station. The subject for discussion was military training in educational institutions. Five minutes before the debate was to start an order came from the president's office to cancel the debate. The reason given for his action, by President Francis D. Farrell, was that most of the people of Kansas did not know that a unit of the reserve officers' training corps was situated at the college, and it was no time to begin agitation on the subject.⁵¹

In a speech before the house of representatives on June 4, 1929, Representative Ross A. Collins of Mississippi summed up the whole military policy since the World War. He stated that

The total number in all of these military establishments [branches of citizens' army], including the regular army, is about 700,000, and constitute an army very much bigger than the average citizen realizes. Of course, it must be admitted that many of these citizens' military trainees are encouraged to be in these units by regular army management for propaganda purposes only. They are given sugar-coated training because they will become boosters of the war game idea. Whatever their purpose in being in these organizations does not matter; we are confronted with a stern reality that

⁵¹This incident was related by Prof. Harrison B. Summers to a class in argumentation and debate in 1931. The author was a member of the class.

there exists in the United States a military establishment, numbering around 700,000 persons, and that it is growing rapidly year by year, and that it has the lawful, regular, legislative, authorized authority to grow. It is evident, also, that the time is near at hand when it will approach the million mark, and then the 2,000,000 mark will be close at hand, and when it reaches 1,000,000, members of congress who stand in its way will be retired to private life; then we will find ourselves in the attitude of humbly obeying commands that will sternly be given us.⁵²

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Government Documents:

Annual Report of the Secretary of War. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1903, 1925.

Congressional Record, 66 Cong., 67 Cong., 69 Cong., 70 Cong., 71 Cong.

Cooper, John C., "The Question of Military Instruction," School Life, Vol. XVII. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (March, 1932), p. 131.

Davis, Robert C., "Good Citizenship the Aim of Citizens' Military Training Camps," School Life, Vol. X. Government Printing Office (April, 1925), pp. 141-143.

House Report No. 821, 66 Cong., 2 Sess.

⁵²Congressional Record, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 1,160.

House Report No. 1,168, 66 Cong., 3 Sess.

House Report No. 1,264, 66 Cong., 3 Sess.

House Report No. 791, 67 Cong., 2 Sess.

House Report No. 1,397, 67 Cong., 4 Sess.

House Report No. 288, 68 Cong., 1 Sess.

House Report No. 1,071, 68 Cong., 2 Sess.

House Report No. 197, 69 Cong., 1 Sess.

House Report No. 1,753, 69 Cong., 2 Sess.

House Report No. 497, 70 Cong., 1 Sess.

House Report No. 1,991, 70 Cong., 2 Sess.

Official Army Register. Government Printing Office,
Washington, D. C., 1933.

Senate Report No. 24, 66 Cong., 1 Sess.

Senate Report No. 400, 66 Cong., 2 Sess.

Statutes at Large of the United States of America,
Vols. XLI, XLII, XLIV, XLV. Government Printing
Office, Washington, D. C., May, 1919 to March,
1929.

Semiofficial Documents:

Malloy, John A., Compiler, United States Compiled
Statutes. West Publishing Company, St. Paul,
C. 1918.

Articles:

Harbord, James G., "Army as a Career," Atlantic
Monthly, Vol. XXXII (September, 1923), pp. 333-
342.

"Over the Hill," Infantry Journal, Vol. XXXII
(February, 1928), pp. 150-155.

Peyton, Mary, "The Army Woman in Fort Benning," Infantry Journal, Vol. XXXII (June, 1928), pp. 581-587.

"Reserve Officers' Legislative Committee," Infantry Journal, Vol. XXVIII (January, 1926), p. 109.

Summerall, Charles P., "Compulsory Military Training in American Colleges," Current History, Vol. XXIV (April, 1926), pp. 27-34.

Tannenbaum, Frank, "The Moral Devastation of War," The Dial, Vol. LXVI (April 5, 1919), pp.333-336.

Newspapers:

New York Times, April, 1920 to September, 1923.

Books:

Pesons, William E., Military Science and Tactics, 2 vols. University Company Co-Operative Store, Columbia, Missouri, C. 1921.

Pamphlets:

Proceedings of the Twelfth Triennial Convention of the Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States. Issued Under Authority of National Commandery, New York, N. Y., 1929.

Regulations for Citizens' Military Training Camps. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1921.

United States Army Training Manual. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1924.

Secondary Sources

Articles:

"A Debate on Military Training in Schools and Colleges," School and Society, Vol. XXIV

(January 17, 1926), p. 70.

"Are the Schools Being Militarized?" Literary Digest, Vol. LXXXVII (December 26, 1925), pp. 22-23.

Blanshard, Paul, "Military 'Glory' in the Colleges," The Nation, Vol. CXX (February 18, 1925), pp. 183-184.

Coe, George A., "What Do Professors Think of Military Training in High Schools?" School and Society, Vol. XXVI (August 6, 1927), pp. 174-178.

"Compulsory Military Drill at the College of the City of New York," School and Society, Vol. XXVI (November 19, 1929), pp. 647-648.

"Discrediting the Army," New Republic, Vol. XXXIV (April 18, 1923), p. 204.

Freeman, E. M., "R. O. T. C.--A Waster of Youth," Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (February 25, 1931), pp. 266-268.

Gale, Zona, "Don't Be Silly," The Nation, Vol. CXXVIII (April 10, 1920), pp. 422-423.

Gilford, Duff, "Militarist Bait for Students," New Republic, Vol. LX (October 2, 1929), pp. 168-170.

Hedges, M. H., "On Trial: Officers' Reserve Corps," The Nation, Vol. CXIV (May 24, 1922), p. 616.

"Henrietta Spills the Beans," The Nation, Vol. CXX (April 22, 1925), pp. 456-457.

"Military Training Losing Ground in Colleges," Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (January 14, 1931), p. 45.

"Scabbard and Rattle," New Republic, Vol. L (May 21, 1927), pp. 290-291.

"Sex and the R. O. T. C.," The Nation, Vol. CXXVIII (May 1, 1929), pp. 523-524.

Spears, T. Guthrie, "Educating for War," Christian Century, Vol. XLVII (November 12, 1930), pp. 1,382-1,384.

"The A B C of Universal Training," World's Work, Vol. XXXIX (April, 1920), pp. 537-538.

"The Military Guillotine," Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (June 3, 1931), p. 732.

"To Raise All Our Boys to Be Soldiers," Literary Digest, Vol. LXII (August 23, 1919), p. 14.

"Training for War," in New Republic, Vol. XLV (December 16, 1925), pp. 100-102.

Tucker, Robert L., "Ohio State--Battleground of Freedom," Christian Century, Vol. XLVIII (June 17, 1931), pp. 805-807.

Watts, M. B., "Service Wife," American Mercury, Vol. XXV (February, 1932), pp. 160-166.

Wohlforth, Robert, "Catch 'Em Young--Teach 'Em Rough," New Republic, Vol. LXIV (October 22, 1930), pp. 257-258.