

L
13
N2825
MAR 27 1917
UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

N.E.A. BULLETIN

Vol. V. No. 5

March, 1917

Whole Number 27

Entered as second-class matter March 22, 1913, at the post-office at Ann Arbor, Michigan, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Published September, December, January, February, April and June, by the National Education Association of the United States. Office of publication, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

1917 MEETING—PORTLAND, OREGON, JULY 7-14

NOTES

The February number of the Bulletin is the regular **Yearbook**, which will be mailed to the active members very soon.

All the proof for the Annual Volume of Proceedings has been read and distribution of the same will begin next week.

The checking of attendance at Kansas City has not been completed but it is certain that the meeting was the second largest in the history of the Department, being exceeded only by the Detroit meeting. It is also evident that more persons were present from outside Missouri than were present at Detroit from outside of Michigan.

This extra Bulletin is issued because of the request on the part of such a large number of our members for the report of the Committee on Military Training and the General Principles of the report of the Committee on the Relation of Boards of Education and Superintendents. We will keep the form standing for three weeks and if extra copies are desired they should be ordered at once.

The Executive Committee, at a meeting held in Kansas City March 2, definitely decided upon Portland, Oregon, as the place for the 1917 meeting and July 7-14 as the time. The railroads interested in the direct traffic to the Northwest Territory have named a round trip rate of \$67.50 from Chicago and \$55 from St. Paul, Minneapolis, Omaha, Kansas City and other Missouri River gateways. It is expected that the other roads will grant reduced rates. The Multnomah Hotel will be headquarters. Plan to go.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY TRAINING

To the President and Members of the Department of Superintendence, National Education Association:—

A resolution, adopted last year at Detroit, instructed this Committee "to report upon the proper place for, and purpose of, military education of American youth."

In complying with this instruction, your Committee has had no difficulty in reaching its conclusions, but has not found it easy in some instances to find forms

of expression which clearly reflect the full consideration of the subject in all the aspects considered by the Committee because of the confusion and misapprehension of terms employed in its general discussion, and because of the prevalent difference in the conception of the purpose of military education.

Military education makes a strong appeal to many citizens because of the influence which, in their opinion, it exerts upon the physical bearing and the mental attitude of its recipients. This is especially true in times when the prospect of war is remote or non-existent, when there seems to be no need for the soldier. Your Committee can not take this view. At the present time, when the demand for trained soldiers is frequently heard, there is less tendency to evasion, and the real purpose is more commonly expressed. Military education must mean the education or preparation of the man for the life and work of the soldier, and for his effective participation in warlike operations, otherwise the limitation of the idea or the specialization of the term by the word "military" would be meaningless. It must be understood, therefore, that in this report it is this evident purpose of the comprehensive term "military education" which the Committee has in mind.

The terms "military education," "military training," and "military drill" are commonly used synonymously. While there is no objection to this, inherent in the etymology or use of the terms, there are very wide differences in the minds of those who use them and in the thoughts which they are intended to express. It is this confusion in the use of these terms which is responsible for many apparent differences of opinion in discussions regarding "military education." In order that statements made in this report may not be misunderstood your Committee deems it necessary to limit or isolate the use of each. The comprehensive term "military education" and the term "military training," which is made more specific by its general use in official military treatises and reports, refers, according to the understanding of your Committee, to the direct, practical, intensive training which is given to the recruit in the army, or to one who is preparing for actual warfare, as it is now carried on—a form of training which differs widely from that formerly in use. The term "military drill" has long been used to designate the exercises which in former years were intended to train the soldier, and included "training with a musket, manual of arms, and close order formation. In a word, an imitation of the sort of training which a young man receives at the armory when he goes into the militia." Because of the long use of the term in this way, and of its common acceptance in this sense, its limited application is retained in this report.

The military training of boys, in the sense in which we use the term, may be established in several ways. Three may be mentioned as most worthy of consideration: (1) It may be made compulsory upon boys of prescribed ages attending elementary and secondary schools, and upon boys of similar ages not attending school; (2) it may be made compulsory on boys attending secondary schools; (3) it may be optional with boys of school age who are acceptable. Of these the first two plans are most commonly suggested. When we think of the ages of the boys of the elementary schools and consider that the great majority of those in the high schools are under sixteen years of age, we must realize that they are too immature, intellectually, to grasp fully the significance of the training and its responsibilities, or to take it seriously. When we think of the bodily immaturity of the great mass of boys, even of the secondary schools, and consider that only a very few of these may be regarded as sufficiently developed, we must realize how impossible it is for them to perform satisfactorily the arduous work of training, and must agree with Dr. Eliot, who says "that training in the real work of a soldier, that is, marching under a heavy load, digging as rapidly as

possible in the ground, and using effectively rifles, machine guns, hand grenades, bayonets, * * * heavy and light artillery * * * should not be before the twentieth year."

We must remember also that just at the time when military enthusiasts would force the boy into military training, somewhere between the ages of twelve and eighteen, he is undergoing most important life-changes, during which his mental attitude toward the relations and activities of life is subject to the most serious readjustment and he is passing rapidly in physique from boyhood to manhood. It is an educational and moral offense to snatch him from the natural life of boyhood and place him in what ought to be a man's job, and thus expose him to the risk, if not certainty, of mental and physical injury.

The force of these objections has been recognized by advocates of military training who sometimes suggest that it be limited to pupils of secondary schools. Besides the objections to this plan, which have been offered, others present themselves. The amount of time which must be devoted to special military training, whether it is conducted in or out of school hours, must be sufficient to make it of apparent value. This is bound to interfere with the pupil's progress in his school course. The pupil of the high school has entered the period when he must choose his career and has begun accordingly to specialize in his studies. He is devoting more time to self-selected study and work. For these all the time he can devote to them properly is needed. The added duty of military training must necessarily divert his attention from his aim in life, and take time which ought to be devoted to preparation for it, and must place too much emphasis on a special activity in which he will probably never be engaged.

In recent years much attention has been devoted to vocational education, which has been encouraged and aided by state and national laws. Military training, by occupying the time and diverting the attention of the pupils, will greatly interfere with its development and operation.

By subjecting secondary-school pupils, or, indeed any selected class of pupils, to military training, and relieving others of it, the duty of the national defense will be imposed upon those who seek a better education. To quote from the Report of the New Jersey Commission on Military Training in High Schools:

"Military training and service, if they are necessary, are an obligation of citizenship, not of education alone.

"It is difficult to contemplate with satisfaction or even complacency the social cleavage which is bound to result from a system of military instruction which is applied to high school pupils and not to other boys. To assign or reserve the privilege, or duty, or obligation, however it is regarded, of preparing to fight for the country, to the better educated class, is just as repugnant to democratic ideals as was the practice in days long gone by of leaving it to the nobility. To select high school pupils for this training is open to the same objection as would be a plan of selecting adults for actual military service solely on the basis of their occupations or professions, a plan which would receive no consideration."

If the obligation of military training is imposed upon any boys who are attending school, they may easily evade it, if they so desire, by leaving school. In the efforts which we are constantly making to keep pupils in school, by means of compulsory education and child-labor laws, state and national, by means of personal and social influences, we shall be confronted with a superior force which will draw pupils out of school, or be a barrier to their entrance.

The entire scheme of military training for school boys is useless if not followed by thoro training when they become mature enough mentally and physi-

cally to receive and endure persistent, strenuous, practical preparation for actual warfare. If, moreover, this universal practical training is required of mature young men by state or national laws, the military training of school boys must again be considered not only useless and unnecessary for the very purpose for which it is required, but seriously detrimental to the welfare of the pupils and to the community.

Enough has been said to indicate our firm conviction that any plan of military training of school boys or boys of school age, which is based upon the option or choice of the individual is objectionable, not only from the military and civic, but also from the educational viewpoint. It ignores the fundamental principle taught in all schools, namely, that loyalty and service are due the nation from all youth.

As persons in many ways interested in the guidance of the education of the young, in the formulation of educational processes and the use of educational materials, and in the application of these processes and materials to the purposes of training the young for all activities of life, we must look at military training from the educational point of view. We thus consider all the elements involved in the courses of instruction of elementary and secondary schools with a view to the results to which they lead and which have an influential bearing upon adult life. We frame courses of instruction which lead to all the occupations, professions and interests of everyday life, in which pupils eventually engage. With the constant changes in commercial, industrial, and professional conditions, and with the wider appreciation of the value of intellectual growth, we are confronted with new educational problems or demands which we endeavor to solve or meet with appropriate educational courses or processes. We know the beginning and the end of every such course or process. With military education the situation is quite different. There appears to be no suggestion on the part of the advocates of military training for school boys that those who are engaged in the work of the schools and are competent to direct it, outline profitable forms of instruction for pupils of elementary and secondary schools which shall be fundamental to the serious military training and services of adults, but we are urged, without consideration of the propriety of processes or their logical results, to impose on school boys a fragmentary course of instruction which, it is admitted, is a mere beginning, and whose completion, in the form of a subsequent military training or service of men, has not thus far been provided for either by any state or by the nation. It must be considered remarkable that legislators of the different states and of the national Congress, who urge this proceeding upon us, seem to shrink from exacting military training of the young men who have reached maturity, and who are competent to undergo, and at the same time, seek unhesitatingly to require it of school boys.

For reasons which have been given, and which we believe are dictated by sound educational policy, we must object to such an imposition. We cannot condemn too strongly this practice of violating well-established educational principles, and procedure, and of evading the dictates of civic and military propriety. If military training is necessary in this country, if we have reached the time when we must, besides continuing the pursuit of peaceful arts, prepare also for the art of war, this training should be given to men or at least to those who have attained the maturity of mind and body, which will enable them to receive it seriously and successfully. What has been said has special force in the present crisis in our international relations. The training of boys for the future is of no value now. If a large army is needed now it is men who must be trained. We can not wait until the boys grow up.

We do not wish to be understood as advocating the policy of training men for war. On the other hand, we are opposed to such a policy, if it is at all possible to avoid it. We wish simply to assert strongly that military training has no proper place in the educational course of school boys.

The opinion which your Committee has expressed finds abundant corroboration in the practice of the nations of the world. The great military nations, Germany, France, England, Russia, Japan, whose efficiency in the operations of the present war has been demonstrated, have not relied on the military training of boys. Australia is the only participant which may properly be regarded as providing for it. Altho it has also required the training of men, it has recently rejected by popular vote the proposition of compulsory military service, which ought to be the logical result of compulsory training, and has thus practically denied the wisdom or efficiency of such training. The military system of Switzerland, which is often commended as peculiarly appropriate to this country, requires military training and service of men over twenty, but does not require military training of school boys.

Leading military authorities in this country, whose point of view is, of course, different from that of ours, do not advise the military training of boys. Generals Wood, Goethals, and Young have expressed opinions which this report accurately reflects.

New York State is the only state of the Union, so far as we know, which has adopted legislation providing for the compulsory military training of boys. The action of this state is open to the objections which have been noted herein. We call attention to the discriminatory feature whereby "any boy who is regularly and lawfully employed in any occupation for a livelihood" is not required to take the training, and to the omission of the state to impose the compulsory training upon men or, at least, on those over nineteen years of age.

For similar reasons we must record our objection to that section of the law of the national Congress approved June 3, 1916, which invites school boys over fourteen years of age in bodies of not less than one hundred to undertake a course of military training, which must be an officially recognized part of the established school curriculum, under national control and direction, and with national support. We note that Congress had not yet provided funds enough to make the plan effective, and must conclude that it does not regard the plan seriously as a measure of defense.

We are opposed to this plan, as well as that of the state of New York, primarily, for educational reasons, but also because of the pretense which prompts them.

Finally, we cite the reports of the "Special Commission on Military Education and Reserve" of Massachusetts, of 1915, and the "Commission on Military Training in High Schools" of New Jersey, of 1917, both of which, after thoro investigation and consideration, rejected the military training of boys as inadvisable.

What, then, is the place of military education or military training of American youth? We should like to say that there is no place in this age of advanced education, which recognizes the supremacy of humanitarian ideals, which recognizes the mutual dependence of the nations of the earth and of their peoples upon each other, which recognizes the brotherhood of all races and creeds, that enlightened nations can acknowledge as such. We have said that as teachers of the young, we must look at the subject from the educational point of view, but as citizens, who have a vital interest in the welfare of the nation and in the protection of the people we can and must look at it from the national point of view, from the point of view of the nation's needs. If, therefore, we cannot realize peaceful ideals, if it is necessary for us to resort to force, we are compelled to say, as we have said, that the obligation of military preparation should be borne by those who are capable

of it, and that the age of those should not be less than nineteen. Just as competent authorities agree that it is inadvisable to require military training of school boys, as we have shown, so there is practically unanimity among them that profitable training can be begun at the age of nineteen or twenty.

To be specific, we favor a course of military training which shall be universal and obligatory for all young men of nineteen years of age and over who are physically qualified, which shall be required of them at some time during the twentieth and twenty-first year, and which shall be maintained, directed, and paid for by the federal government. It is only by making this training universal and compulsory and thus recognizing the quality of obligation which loyalty to our country and the demand for service in her behalf impose upon all citizens, that we can satisfy truly democratic ideals. By limiting the ages during which the training is given, the number of those in training is fixed, the period during which the training is likely to be taken with the greatest profit and the least personal inconvenience is determined, and opportunity is afforded to the young men for the necessary adjustment of personal, educational, or occupational interests. As the military service toward which the training looks must be made efficient and must be rendered in behalf of the whole country, the training should be administered under national direction and at national expense.

We feel compelled, moreover, to say that if we must prepare and train men to be soldiers, our legislatures, national and state, must not evade the issue by shifting the burden to the shoulders of school boys, but should frankly and courageously place it where it belongs.

In this discussion we have referred only to the training of boys and men. Those who advocate military training for boys sometimes urge that girls receive corresponding training of an appropriate kind in the form of first-aid instruction, sanitation, and nursing. We have not referred to this because we do not regard it as exclusively military. It is rather personal or domestic and may be defended as proper training for all young women for all the experiences of life.

We do not favor military drill, using the term as we have defined it, in elementary and secondary schools. If it is claimed to be military training, as it sometimes is, its military results are negligible, as most military authorities assert, and as may easily be determined when its exercises are compared with the vigorous and varied activities of actual training. A careful examination of the exercises conducted in some of the high schools of Wyoming leads to the conclusion that these do not constitute a plan of military training but must be classed as a form of military drill, to which special athletic features are added. That military drill gives little stimulus or inspiration for actual service is proved by the small number of cadets who enter the national guard when eligible. As a matter of fact, in the cases of most companies of cadets which have been maintained in schools for many years past, the military purpose has usually been concealed by teachers and ignored by parents, and arguments for their existence have been based upon claims of their general disciplinary value. If words mean anything, the serious ultimate purpose of military drill must be efficiency in military service, altho this may be remote. There is just as much objection to disguising this purpose, if it exists, as to exaggerating its importance. If its purpose is not a military one but personal discipline, the term is a misnomer and the word "military" should be omitted.

Military drill has been maintained in the schools of a number of cities of Massachusetts for many years. The opinion of the Special Commission on Military Education of that state, referred to above, is therefore important. To quote the report: "The overwhelming weight of opinion from school teachers, military experts, officers of both the regular army and the militia, and the general public

is against military drill. It is generally agreed that the military drill which a boy receives in school is of little or no advantage to him from the point of view of practical soldiering. As far as available evidence goes, drill in the schools has had no beneficial effect in promoting enlistments in the militia except in a few isolated localities."

It is often claimed that military exercises, whether we call them military training or military drill, offer the best method of training pupils in obedience, promptness, truthfulness, industry, and other desirable personal traits, in short, of developing personal character, and of training pupils physically. Those engaged in the work of education are practically unanimous in asserting that these claims have no justification. The New Jersey Commission on Military Training makes the following comment:

"It is sometimes claimed that military training is the best agency for inculcating obedience. But if this claim is carefully considered it will be found that obedience to military authority is generally unthinking. It is often blind and superficial, not real. During actual war, men willingly undergo training because the work is definitely motivated; but when peace comes and men go into barracks, they feel that there is nothing of value in drill and there is a consequent tendency to evade its requirements. This kind of obedience has been, and may be, secured by similar school methods. It is obedience under restraint. When this is removed, laxity in discipline often follows. The discipline of the schools aims not at isolated acts of obedience under special circumstances, but at the habit of obedience to elders and persons in authority. It is a psychological fallacy to suppose that obedience to military authority, indeed, obedience exacted under any peculiar circumstances, may automatically be translated into the general habit of obedience. The same may be said of such qualities as alertness, promptness, industry, truthfulness, etc. It is by no means capable of demonstration that those who have had military training, or been subject to military discipline, are superior to other citizens in the possession of these qualities."

The ideals of the kind of obedience and of general personal conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word "martinet," which these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary—ideals which every teacher who aims at real character-development, seeks to avoid.

Those who favor military drill maintain that it is the most effective means of developing patriotic feeling. If this theory were well founded we should all be eager to adopt it, for, as teachers of the young, we acknowledge the responsibility which regard for the patriotic citizenship of our children places upon us, and agree that we must be unceasing in our efforts to plant the virtue of patriotism in their hearts. But, if we look beneath the surface, we find that military patriotism may be no deeper and no more lasting than military obedience. We must not confuse excitement with patriotism, the showy exhibition with real love of country. The quiet, peace-loving citizen may be the most devoted patriot. All who are familiar with the development and guidance of right emotions in children know that genuine, abiding patriotism is the result of intelligent, continued study of our country's history, reflection upon the lives of the men who have made it great, and the sacrifices which they made in its behalf, thoro understanding of our institutions, appreciation of the provisions which our laws make for the prosperity and happiness of the people. It is studies such as these, and the mental activities which they inspire and stimulate which make our children loyal, patriotic citizens in times of peace, willing to sacrifice themselves, if necessary, when war comes. In decrying military drill we devote ourselves all the more willingly and eagerly, especially in the crises of our country, to the processes which are known to produce the truly patriotic men and women whom the country needs. But we go further.

We must teach our pupils to make the passage from love of country to love of mankind, love of humanity, a transition which civilization teaches us to make, but which the spirit of military drill can not make, but rather tends to prevent.

It is customary for enthusiasts to emphasize the value of military exercises for purposes of physical training. It is the almost universal testimony of educators and physical training instructors that military training and military drill, in the sense of training with a musket and other military accoutrement, does not give school pupils the best possible physical development. Any exercise, made in close order formation, with outer garments often heavy and close fitting, does not permit the free movement necessary to the full and symmetrical growth of young people. The routine, automatic action, and uniformity incident to it, tend to repress individual freedom of action. Furthermore, the monotony of the work is shown by the general difficulty in retaining cadets in the companies.

Dr. Dudley A. Sargent, of Harvard University, states the case very clearly in these words:

"Our principal objection to military drill as a physical exercise is that it does not to any extent meet the physiological demands of the body. In other words, it is not of sufficient interest as a means of physical development to arouse any moral earnestness and enthusiasm on the part of the boys. The exercise of the manual is not performed with sufficient force and rapidity to insure the energetic contraction of the muscles employed. It is essentially a one-sided exercise, bringing into excessive action the elevators of the right scapula, the deltoid, biceps, flexors of the forearm, wrist, and fingers of the right side; while the other muscles, excepting the legs on parade days, do not get sufficient employment to keep them in good condition. It does not increase the respiration and quicken the circulation to a sufficient extent to secure the constitutional benefits that should accrue from exercise.

"During the drill the clothing is buttoned close around the chest and natural respiration is hindered. The muscles are not alternately contracted and relax but are tetanized, or kept in a state of prolonged tension. This, as we have seen, not only impairs the tone of the muscles used, but also puts an additional strain upon the brain and nervous system at the time when both should be as much relieved as possible. Finally, the mere exercise of the manual of arms does not give sufficient breadth and scope of movement to secure the cooperation of the muscles, and as a training for the central nerve system it is of little or no value.

"In reference to the gracefulness that is thought to characterize the movements of cadets, we can only say it is not the outcome of drilling and marching. The soldier is trained to square corners, straight platoons, and angular movements; curves and embellishments are not encouraged in speech or in action. If you would account for the graceful poise of our national cadets, you should visit West Point in summer and see them from one to two hours a day in charge of the dancing master.

"After taking the most favorable view possible of military drill as a physical exercise, we are led to conclude that its constrained positions and closely localized movements do not afford the essential requisites for developing the muscles and improving the respiration and circulation, thereby improving the general health and condition of the system. We must further conclude that in the case of any malformation, local weakness, or constitutional debility, the drill tends, by its strain upon the nerves and prolonged tension on the muscles, to increase the defects rather than to relieve them."

Dr. W. E. Darby, of London, adds:

"It (physical training) should not be military, and for the following among other reasons: Because as a method of physical training military drill is both

inadequate and injurious. Experiments, which were conducted in a public school, with a view to ascertain the relative value of gymnastics and of more drill, showed that the average results yielded by the former were more than three times as great as those yielded by drill alone. Relatively, therefore, this method of physical culture is inferior. * * *

Ex-President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University affirms:

"Military drill seems to me one of the poorest forms of bodily exercises; very inferior to most gymnastic exercises and to all free sports. There is too much routine and automatic action in it and too much repression of individual freedom. The only good part of it is the 'setting-up drill,' which can easily be made a gymnastic exercise without military accompaniments."

The opinion of Capt. H. J. Koehler, instructor of physical training, West Point Military Academy, is especially significant. It is as follows:

"The use of the musket as a means of physical development for any one, be he man or boy, is more than worthless. It 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. A thoro physical training develops all the necessary soldierly qualities to the greatest degrees and it does it without injury. If we have athletes, we shall never be without soldiers."

Abundant testimony of a similar nature from the highest authorities can be advanced to support the contention that health, strength, vigor, alertness, endurance, self-reliance, and self-control can be taught more effectively by a well-graded course in physical training than by any form of so-called military training.

The superior value of thoro physical training, not only in general, for all the purposes of life, but, what is particularly noteworthy in this discussion, for the specific purpose of preparing men for war is acknowledged by military authorities, as we have seen, and is demonstrated by the practice followed in the present War of detaining men in training camps a whole year before sending them to the fighting line, not merely to train them in the technical art of fighting but to render them able physically to endure the terrific strain of battle.

The general prevalence of physical incapacity is shown by the results of physical examinations, wherever and whenever they have been conducted systematically, by examiners of life-insurance companies, by the medical inspectors of schools and colleges, and by the surgeons of the army. Much as the War Department has needed men, it has been able to accept less than 21 per cent of the men who have offered themselves for enlistment. Of those who sought enlistment in the United States Marine Corps only 9 per cent have been accepted.

In view of all that has been said, your Committee must urge most strongly the pre-eminent importance of thoro physical training to all pupils of the schools and to the men and women of the country. Your Proceedings and the expressions of all thoughtful teachers have for years shown that the need of it has been recognized and urged by those who are directing the work of the schools and has not merely been made evident by present conditions. The present apparent imminence of the call for physically competent men has compelled an analysis of the results of agencies which provide them and has accentuated our educational deficiencies.

It is true that physical health and strength are emphasized in all schools and that thoro physical training is given in some; but your Committee recommends that a most comprehensive plan of bodily training, health-protection, and sanitary precaution be provided by all the states, thru statutory enactments, for all pupils, and that all the instruction and exercises included in such a plan be made obligatory upon all pupils, boys and girls, of all ages who attend the schools. As Dr. Thomas D. Wood of Columbia University says:

"We ought to have provision for a national program of compulsory health and physical training in both elementary and high schools. This should be developed in such a comprehensive program that our children and youth would be assured of a higher degree of efficiency for the whole progress of civilization."

Such a plan ought to include:

1. Physical drill exercises for the purpose of building up the body. These exercises should include setting-up exercises with emphasis on posture and discipline, gymnastics, marching, organized and supervised play, recreation, athletics, including also summer camps and outdoor life, wherever possible, for the whole or part of the vacation. This work should always be intensive, should be graduated and adapted to the ages and needs of pupils, should aim to train pupils in health, strength, vigor, alertness, endurance, self-reliance and self-control, and should include suitable provision for the correction of bodily defects.

2. Personal hygiene for the purpose of caring for the body. Inspection in this line should include frequent medical inspection that will devote special attention to the laws of health, and strength, and to the discovery and removal of defective bodily conditions.

3. Instruction in sanitation and safety precautions at home and in camp for the purpose of guarding against disease and injury.

While thus showing our eagerness for the welfare of the children of the schools, we also recognize the obligation of the public-school system to consider and provide for the physical well-being of the thousands of boys and girls who are compelled to leave the schools early in life, an obligation which is partly met by the maintenance of evening and continuation schools and recreation and community centers. The comprehensive plan of physical training which we have in mind contemplates the application of the measures, which we have mentioned, to all these, as far as possible, so that all young people, whether in school or out, shall have the advantage of effective physical instruction and exercise. The result must be a much higher standard of health and strength for our people.

In line with these thoro provisions for the physical education of the youth we must array all the civic and social forces of school and home, which develop and intensify intelligent and appreciative loyalty to our country and its institutions and all personal, civic, and social virtues, in short, which can be made to assist in developing upright, sturdy personal character. Our efforts should be vigorously extended to the thousands who come to us from foreign countries, so that we may be a people homogeneous and united in loyalty to our country's laws and institutions and appreciative of the value and responsibility of American citizenship. The Boy Scout movement and the activities of similar associations of young people, which avoid military exercises, but which involve features designed to promote health and strength, and inculcate courtesy, mutual respectfulness, uprightness and patriotic devotion, should be encouraged.

It would be an easy matter to show that the plans for military training or military drill, which have been proposed in state legislatures or in Congress, would, if adopted, cost the people many millions of dollars, while its results would, without doubt, be disappointing in every sense. How much more valuable to the youth of the country, whether for all the demands of everyday life or for military service, would be the expenditure of part of this vast sum for the purpose of benefitting all boys and girls physically and thus giving greater assurance of their happiness in life!

Finally, we wish to assert that our recommendations are dictated solely by our deep sense of the responsibility of the schools for the complete and effective education of the youth—education which may be used both for the advantage of the individual and for the welfare and protection of the nation.

The conclusions and recommendations of your Committee are summarized as follows:

1. Since it appears that we have not yet reached the time when we may escape war, the Committee favors and recommends the adoption of a plan of intensive and specific military training for young men of nineteen years of age and over to be conducted during the twentieth and twenty-first years. This training should be universal and compulsory upon young men of the ages mentioned who are physically qualified, should include all the features necessary to prepare young men practically and effectively for the work of the soldier, should be provided and directed by the national government and at its expense, and should be given by expert instructors provided by the national government.

2. The Committee is opposed to the introduction of military training and military drill, or any form of instruction which is distinctly or specifically military, into the elementary or secondary schools.

3. A thoro and comprehensive plan of physical training should be provided and made compulsory upon all boys and girls of all ages attending the schools. This plan should include physical exercises, setting-up drills with emphasis upon posture and discipline, marching, organized and supervised play, recreation, athletics, gymnastics, summer camps and outdoor life, wherever possible, for the whole or part of the vacations. This work should always be intensive, should be graduated and adapted to the ages and needs of pupils, should aim to train pupils in health, strength, vigor, alertness, endurance, self-reliance, and self-control and should include suitable provision for the correction of bodily defects. At the same time, provision should be made for the extension of similar kinds of instruction to young people, who are not in school, thru agencies already established, such as evening and continuation schools, recreation and community centers, and others which may be established.

4. Special attention should be directed to personal hygiene. This should include the care of the body, frequent, thoro, compulsory medical inspection, and a consideration of the laws of health, strength, and vigor.

5. Provision should be made for instruction in sanitation and safety precautions for the purpose of guarding against disease and injury. For this purpose voluntary camp life during vacations should be encouraged, as well as outdoor exercises and hikes into the country.

6. Patriotic and civic service should be a prominent feature of an American education. This work should include the study of the history of our country, accurately and frankly presented, a study of the people, the aims, efforts, and sacrifices of our great leaders, stimulation of a love of country, the opportunities for rendering service, the Americanization of the thousands of foreigners coming to our shores each year, and the development in them of an appreciation of the value and responsibility of American citizenship. The spirit and purpose of the Boy Scout movement, as contributing to these purposes, should be recognized.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY SNYDER, Jersey City, N. J., Chairman
WM. DAVIDSON, Pittsburgh, Pa.
F. B. DYER, Boston, Mass.
J. M. GWINN, New Orleans, La.
F. B. COOPER, Seattle, Wash.
C. S. MEEK, San Antonio, Texas
A. W. EDSON, New York, N. Y.

After the report had been presented, Superintendent Randall J. Condon, of Cincinnati, offered the following resolutions which were adopted with only a few scattering negative votes:

Resolved, That the recommendations of the Committee on Military Education of American Youth be and they are hereby adopted as the recommendations of this Department, namely:

1 Since it appears that we have not yet reached the time when we may escape war, we favor and recommend the adoption of a plan of intensive and specific military training for young men of nineteen years of age and over to be conducted during the twentieth and twenty-first years. This training should be universal and compulsory upon young men of the ages mentioned who are physically qualified, should include all the features necessary to prepare young men practically and effectively for the work of the soldier, should be provided and directed by the National Government and at its expense, and should be given by expert instructors provided by the National Government.

2. We are opposed to the introduction of military training and military drill, or any form of instruction which is distinctively or specifically military, into the elementary or secondary schools.

3. A thoro and comprehensive plan of physical training should be provided and made compulsory upon all boys and girls of all ages attending the schools. This plan should include physical exercises, setting-up drills with emphasis upon posture and discipline, marching, organized and supervised play, recreation, athletics, gymnastics, summer camps and outdoor life, wherever possible, for the whole or part of the vacations. This work should always be intensive, should be graduated and adapted to the ages and needs of pupils, should aim to train pupils in health, strength, vigor, alertness, endurance, self-reliance, and self-control, and should include suitable provision for the correction of bodily defects. At the same time, provision should be made for the extension of similar kinds of instruction to young people, who are not in school, thru agencies already established, such as evening and continuation schools, recreation and community centers, and others which may be established.

4. Special attention should be directed to personal hygiene. This should include the care of the body, frequent thoro, compulsory medical inspection, and a consideration of the laws of health, strength, and vigor.

5. Provision should be made for instruction in sanitation and safety precautions for the purpose of guarding against disease and injury. For this purpose voluntary camp life during vacations should be encouraged, as well as out-door exercises and hikes into the country.

6. Patriotic and civic service should be a prominent feature of an American education. This work should include the study of the history of our country, accurately and frankly presented, a study of the people, the aims, efforts, and sacrifices of our great leaders, stimulation of a love of country, the opportunities for rendering service, the Americanization of the thousands of foreigners coming to our shores each year, and the development in them of an appreciation of the value and responsibility of American citizenship. The spirit and purpose of the Boy Scout movement, as contributing to these purposes, should be recognized.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATION BETWEEN BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDENTS

General Principles

1. The representatives of the people who are in charge of educational systems should realize that they represent, not only the local interests of a narrow district, but the interests of the whole community. Education cannot be complete nor its equipment satisfactory unless localities of very different character are brought into cooperation. Education is a function of the state, not of single communities.

This principle is based on the consideration that population in its readjustments brings constantly into one district people who were shortly before in other districts. Furthermore, the higher forms of education can be supported only by large units of population. Thus the high-school district must be large, and this is still more evident in the case of the state institutions, such as normal schools and universities.

Local school officers often forget that education is the duty of the state. They conceive themselves to be guardians of a narrow district. They seek the advantage of a certain section of the town, or they represent the special interest of some one class in the community.

The board of education which conceives its duty in a large way will not aim to secure in its membership personal representatives of all classes in the community, but will strive to represent the whole system by making adequate studies of the interests of all classes. For example, it is not possible to include in the board personal representatives of every ward or of all the trades and professions, but the board should study the needs of all wards and of all trades and professions.

The tendency in all school systems has been in the direction of a reduction in the number of members of the board. The old idea was a board made up of personal representatives of all interests. The better principle is that the board learns about all interests and represents all interests thru intelligence rather than thru partisan partiality and logrolling.

The realization of this principle appears in the fact that the majority of boards are today made up of persons who represent the school system at large, not by districts.

2. A second general principle issues directly from the first. The representatives of the broad community interests in education should be free from any local entanglements. The same persons should not be involved in a study of the educational needs of a town and in the study of other needs, such as police, fire equipment, and so forth, because these latter are more restricted interests than is education. The educational system is in part paid out of state funds and will from this time on be affected increasingly by national subsidies of particular activities. There will be the largest necessity for a high-minded consideration of the most advantageous disposition of all resources for the good of the state and of the whole community. This requires the divorcement of the school system from local politics, however legitimate the latter may be.

There is, accordingly, a strong tendency to separate the board of education from all branches of local government and to give it autonomy in all matters.

3. The representatives of the people cannot perform directly the large duties of carrying on the school system. They must employ technically trained officers to conduct the schools. To these technically trained officers they must look for proper information on which to base their decisions, and they must be prepared to intrust to those officers the powers and responsibilities which attach to the daily conduct of school work.

There is little doubt on the part of all communities that technical training is necessary for the proper conduct of schools, but the exact definition of the sphere within which technical training is needed is not yet worked out in most systems.

A series of concrete examples may therefore be offered as illustrating the type of duty which board members cannot properly perform. No board member should teach classes. No board member should act as principal of a school. No board member should negotiate with a publisher of textbooks, nor should pass on the availability of a given book for use in a school. No board member should examine teachers with a view to determining their qualifications for appointment. No board member should plan a school building. No board member should write the course of study. Even where individual cases may arise in which particular members of certain boards would have the ability to perform these tasks, it is better that a well-established division of labor should be recognized. It is the duty of the members of the board to see that technical officers do the work of the system, but the board should not do this work itself. It is a public board, created to see that a certain piece of public work is done, not a group of technical officers created to do the work.

The safe analogy in this case is the analogy of the board of directors in a business corporation. No one can imagine a director of a railroad stopping a train and giving the engineer and the conductor orders about their duties. It ought to be possible to organize and define the technical duties of a school system and to distinguish them from the broad duties which reside in the representatives of the people.

4. It is fundamental to the conduct of a school system to recognize that instruction is the end and aim of all that is undertaken. The buildings are erected with a view to the housing of instruction; all supplies are used for instruction; all officers in the system are appointed for the purpose of directing or conducting instruction. It follows that there should be no subordination of instruction to business interests and no separation of the general management of the business concerns of the system from the general management of instruction.

It is sometimes held by board members that they know about business matters and do not know about instruction, and, on the other hand, it is freely asserted that school officers are inefficient in business matters. It is the judgment of the educational profession that board members cannot be intelligent about the conduct of schools unless they secure and thoroly comprehend reports on the instructional phases of school work. It is equally the judgment of the profession that no supervisory officer of a school system is competent to manage the details of a school system if he cannot comprehend the business relations involved. In some large systems there must be a separation of personal duties between the general superintendent and the manager of business details, just as there must be assistant supervisors of instruction. In such cases it is a fundamental requirement of good organization that the instructional demands of the system shall be dominant, and that this fact shall be clearly recognized in the organization.

5. The financial duty of the board is to be described in the statement that the board should see to it that the funds of the system are collected and distributed in a thoroly systematic fashion. This calls for a definite budget, a clear public financial statement, and a careful study of the principles underlying distribution, so that

all the functions of the system may share equitably in the support which is available. If all these requirements are complied with, it may be and often is the duty of the board in the capacity of representatives of the public to make an appeal to the people for further support.

A series of new financial problems have of late arisen to complicate the duties of the board. There is a demand for social centers, for playgrounds, for night schools for adults, and for other activities which cost money and were not formerly a part of school expenditure. The board of education has to decide what share of the public-school money can properly be expended for these types of activity.

There is no problem in which the obligation of the board to the people whom they represent is more clearly exemplified than in this problem of organizing and distributing finances. It is a fundamental mistake for a board to assume that it is called upon to spend the funds of the system. It should organize expenditure and create the proper machinery for making the expenditure, but the board is not the spending agent.

6. The technical officers of the school system will be most harmonious in their activities if they are placed under the supervision of a single head or manager who is the executive head of the system. This central supervisor should have the responsibilities and the rights which will make possible a compact organization of the working force in the schools.

7. The superintendent must be a man of superior training. He must be prepared to report plans of organization and to make a clear statement of results. He should organize the officers under him in such a way as to secure from them in detail an efficient type of organization, and he should secure from them adequate reports on which to base the statements which he presents to the board.

8. In the performance of these functions the superintendent has a right to the initiative in technical matters. Specifically, he should have the sole right to perform the following: (a) recommend all teachers, all officers of supervision, and all janitors and clerks; (b) work out the course of study with the cooperation of the other officers of instruction; (c) select textbooks with the same cooperation; (d) have a determining voice in matters of building and equipment; and (e) draw up the annual budget.

These technical recommendations should always be reviewed by the board, and the approval of the board should be a necessary step for final enactment. This will insure the careful preparation of reports and the careful study of results. The superintendent is not to be authorized to conduct the system apart from the board, but he should be insured by definite forms of organization against interference which will defeat his plans and divide his responsibility.

Public business suffers when these technical matters are improperly handled. Let us assume two cases. In the first case the superintendent may be inefficient, and the board or some other active agency may cover over his inefficiency for a time by doing his work for him. The result will be disastrous in the end. It would be better for public business to bring the inefficiency to the surface as quickly as possible and remove the officer who cannot conduct the system properly. In the second case the superintendent is efficient, but is hampered by lack of definition of his functions. The school system will lack in unity of organization and in harmony of internal operation. The system will be defective in so far as it is divided against itself.

9. In the relations of the board to all officers of the system it is essential that appointment, reappointment, dismissal, and promotion be removed from the interference of petty influences, and that all such transactions be based on records which are systematically organized and supervised.

There is no clearer indication of the condition of a school system than the

attitude of the teachers and other officers to their duties and to the results which they are securing. The school system which is well organized exhibits cooperation on the part of all its officers. The interests of the public suffer beyond measure when appointments are the result of illegitimate personal influences.

10. The demands of an educational system move forward each year with the progress of modern life. There is constant need of development in school policies. There is constant need of additional training on the part of all who participate in the work of the school system. School organization must explicitly provide for continuation training of its technical officers and for systematic review of school policies by all who have to do with the school system. The counterpart of this development of school policies is the preservation of those elements of organization which have proved to be effective. American school systems suffer from instability. The board changes and the superintendent and teachers are of short tenure. There should be a clear recognition of the fact that the training of novices is always expensive. The business world has learned that it often costs more to train a new clerk than to increase the salary of an experienced clerk. American school systems have been most uneconomical in the treatment of their organizations. There should be an effort to insure stability with accompanying progressiveness, a retention of that which is effective with a supplementing and strengthening of that which is weak.

CHARLES E. CHADSEY, Detroit, Mich., Chairman

J. H. FRANCIS, Columbus, Ohio

E. U. GRAFF, Omaha, Nebr.

CHARLES S. PETERSON, Chicago, Ill.

J. H. PHILLIPS, Birmingham, Ala.

F. E. SPAULDING, Minneapolis, Minn.

WILLIAM G. WILLCOX, New York, N. Y.

CHARLES H. JUDD, Chicago, Ill., Secretary

After the General Principles had been read, the following recommendations were unanimously adopted:

First, it is recommended that a committee of ten members, to be known as the Committee on Publicity, be created to bring these principles to the attention of boards of education and communities thru legitimate avenues of public discussion. It is recommended that steps be taken to supply this committee with funds for its work.

Secondly, it is recommended that a commission of ten be created, to be known as the Commission on Administrative Legislation, to work out details in the form of rules suitable for adoption by boards of education, and model laws to be recommended to legislatures, and to present these to this department for action at the next annual meeting. In the performance of this duty the Commission on Administrative Legislation shall give special attention to board rules and laws now in operation and shall, so far as possible, support each of its recommendations by direct reference to such established cases.

Thirdly, it is recommended that a committee of ten be appointed, to be known as the Committee on Cooperation with School Boards, the duty of which shall be to get into communication with school boards or organizations of such bodies and to secure from them as much cooperation as may be possible in defining fully the problems of public-school organization. The special duty of the committee shall be to promote, so far as possible, organizations of sections for school-board members in state educational associations and in the National Education Association, in order that the general principles adopted by this department may be discussed and supplemented by school boards.