CURRENT NOTES

V. A. Leonard (Editor)

Youth and Postwar Military Training.—The people of the United States and their representatives in Congress are being called upon to make a decision concerning the question of compulsory peacetime military training. This decision may possess considerable significance for workers in the social sciences. The question is being given careful scrutiny in several quarters. Among others, the American Association of University Professors has launched a poll of its members to ascertain their views on this question. Of more than passing interest are two recent articles which in part review the case for and against compulsory military training.

The Plus Values of Military Training.—Colonel Allen R. Elliott, Acting Superintendent of Culver Military Academy, stresses the opinion that a military mode of life, properly coordinated with academic work, not only invigorates the study program but develops in youth certain basic characteristics which are important in a well-rounded civilian life. He states that in addition to the educational values of military training, there is the important question of its contribution to national defense. The record of the R. O. T. C. and its graduates speaks for itself in this war. The expansion of our army at the beginning of the war was made possible by the fact that we had at the outset approximately 100,000 reserve officers, most of them products of the R. O. T. C. Since it is believed that military training is of distinct value to those young men fortunate enough to receive it in our colleges and universities, Colonel Elliott is of the considered opinion that a year of army or navy training could be made into a rich educational program for all young Americans. This opinion is offered independent of the fact that some plan which will provide for universal military service now seems mandatory if we are to be prepared for the defense of our existence as a nation. This stern necessity we have heard emphasized by our most eminent military leaders and statesmen.

"Stern necessity" may be made to yield real opportunities and advantages. Attention is directed to the fact that every American youth, no matter what his social, financial or intellectual status, would for one year live the same life as every other young man, wear the same clothes, receive the same pay, eat the same food and do the same work. Is there any doubt that such an experience would be exceedingly beneficial to the individual and to American society and democracy?

Further, the giving of a year of service by every young man would in the very act tend to impress upon him the responsibilities of citizenship. Americans are becoming more and more aware of the fact that they have neglected, especially during their prosperous periods and in their more prosperous areas, the problems of community, state and nation. Our most promising young people have been all too eager to achieve personal success in business or a profession and to "settle down," which often means to immure themselves against whatever may be happening in the world outside their own comfortable interests. This exclusiveness, this unawareness of the thought and the struggles of other Americans, a universal military service can do much to remove.
In view of the fact that only about 10 per cent of our young men enter college, a year of service in the army or navy would provide the opportunity for developing many technical skills and would give experience in many activities applicable to the business of making a living in civilian life. Finally, there would be the great advantage of a well-planned course of physical training, instruction in sanitation and hygiene, in addition to the correction and beginning of treatment for many physical disabilities. The dimensions of the need for this attention is revealed by the large number of young men called for induction under Selective Service regulations who have been rejected for physical disabilities, including a high percentage rejected for psychoneurotic tendencies.

A wisely planned service act would aim at improving the health of our whole population. To obtain the maximum benefits, the physical requirements for service should be set at a low enough level to make practically all eligible who are not physically incapacitated or are not actually invalids. The age for selection is a question that should receive careful study and consideration. The most frequently discussed proposal provides for calling the young man into service at his eighteenth birthday or at the time he graduates from high school, whichever occurs first. Opposition to this policy has been based on the argument that many young men after a year in the army or navy would not continue their education at the college level. A plan could be produced which would make it possible for those young men who elect to go to college to take their military training during four summer periods of three months each. The pay received during these periods of service would assist them in meeting part of their expenses at college. Such a plan could be integrated with the R. O. T. C. program.

Colonel Elliott concludes with the statement that it is difficult for him to see any valid argument against a year of universal service other than that based on the more or less traditional prejudice against things military. It is true that Germany and Japan have used compulsory military training to glorify war and to ingrain in the spirit of youth the qualities that have brought on two world wars in the last twenty-seven years. However, Switzerland, with one of the finest systems of universal service in the world (and based on democratic principles) has been able to avoid invasion for generations, even though war has raged on every side of her. Universal service in the United States must, of course, be based on the American way, the democratic way. The many advantages to her youth physically, educationally and morally, offered by such a program justify its favorable consideration by the American people.

The Case Against Compulsory Military Training.—Dr. Wm. Clark Trow, Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Michigan, expresses the view that if the House and Senate bills for compulsory military training are passed on any other grounds than strict military necessity, American democracy could hardly suffer a greater defeat at the hands of its elected representatives. He states that the proponents of these bills have made no case for military necessity but instead have claimed that educational advantages are to be derived from army and navy training.

The claims sound plausible and many educators have failed to perceive their true significance, states Professor Trow. They have failed to discern the bolstering of a weak military case by specious educational arguments. They have failed to realize that military and educational programs are separate problems. He presents six propositions intended to clarify
the issues: 1. Education is a civilian and not a military function. The military function is to train for war. Society has set up the schools to extend the home environment of our youths in order to promote their physical, mental and moral development. 2. Military necessity is the only valid reason for any plan of universal compulsory military training. Only if it is necessary for the security of our country in the postwar world should it be provided and then be made as "educational" as possible under the circumstances. 3. The case for military necessity must be made much clearer than it has yet been made. Even on military grounds the plan is not acceptable unless the dozen or more other plans for postwar security are shown to be inadequate. We should not be left to conclude, as we have been thus far, that universal compulsory military training is the only solution. 4. Universal compulsory military training is contrary to our long established democratic social and educational policy. Where it has been practiced, it has tended to create a dominant military caste; it has failed to prevent wars; it is a stimulant to truculence and aggression and is a constant threat to world peace. More important, it calls for a centralized bureaucratic control instead of control by states and communities. 5. The remarkable success of the military training programs has been due in large measure to the efforts of those who are responsible for our educational system. The teachers, principals, superintendents, professors and research workers in and out of uniform who have organized the courses of study, written the manuals and trained the teacher officers can provide an effective civilian educational program with adequate support and leadership. 6. It is now the responsibility of educational leaders of the country to carry on. They must see to it that the deficiencies in the educational program are corrected. The arguments for compulsory military training indicate some of the first things that must be done. The time is now ripe for the planning of definite action on a large scale to provide an educational program that will satisfy the needs of American democracy. Such a program will include adequate provision for the development of physical stamina, health, vocational guidance, vocational education and character.

—The Nation's Schools, December, 1944.

Editor's Note: In the arguments for and against compulsory peacetime military training, certain areas of agreement may be observed. Perhaps, with characteristic American ingenuity, we can develop a program that will preserve the values inherent in both points of view.

New York State's Plan for Training Child Welfare Workers.—With the major strategy of crime control shifting from the juvenile delinquent upstream toward the headwaters of early childhood and the developing behavior problem case, a new focus has been placed upon the shortage of trained workers in the field of child welfare. Welfare Departments, Police Departments with child welfare divisions, and other social agencies in the community are seriously handicapped by the lack of trained personnel and must limit the scope of their operations. The manner in which New York State has stepped forward to meet this problem merits the attention of responsible authorities in other states.

Employing the thesis, "Child welfare work is a local responsibility" as the point of departure, the New York State Department of Social Welfare has set in motion a program for the in-service development of local child welfare staffs. The dimensions of the training problem were indicated by the fact that in April, 1943, there were in New York State (exclusive of New York City) 277 child welfare workers employed locally.
Of these 277 workers only 27 were graduates of a school of social work, and only 76 had completed as much as six months' preparation at this level. Many of the workers could not meet the admission requirements of a school of social work. Of the 277 workers, 101 had not completed college work, and 134 were over 35 years of age. In addition to these must be listed the number for whom professional study would not be advisable due to uncertainty of continued employment and other factors.

The work of the department and the training program are decentralized into six areas under area directors whose offices are at different points in the State. To the area directors and their staffs, in addition to other responsibilities falls the job of interpreting to county commissioners and local children's workers the training program, and of encouraging requests for training in communities most in need of service. The training unit assumes responsibility for developing the skills of the worker in the field of case-work problems and for helping her to build up basic knowledge in child welfare. The area office assumes responsibility for developing the total program in the local welfare unit and for providing administrative supervision.

In the program of training for local workers various methods have been used including educational leave, training or consultation on the job, group discussions, short-term orientation and apprenticeship. A local worker may obtain educational leave with pay to receive additional training for the better performance of her duties. Training or consultation on the job before and after educational leave has helped the workers to adjust more quickly to their studies at the school of social work, and after their return such training has helped them to adapt what they have learned to their day-by-day job. Thus far, local workers have been sent to the schools of social work at the University of Chicago, Western Reserve University, Smith College, and the University of Buffalo as well as to the New York School of Social Work.

In the counties selected for training workers on the job, the consultant visits each worker monthly, spending from 2 to 3 days on each occasion depending on the size of the staff. Training on the job has aimed to help the worker in her all-round performance. It includes discussions of the range of duties of the child welfare worker, guidance in the approach to cases under care, and methods of leadership within the agency and in the community. One of the major difficulties encountered is that the worker needs help on a variety of pressing problems scattered over her entire range of duties, many of which are beyond her ability to handle at the beginning of her experience. At the same time it is necessary for the consultant to concentrate sufficiently on a given problem or subject so that the worker can carry over to similar situations the principles of practice and the skills involved. One advantage in this procedure, however, is that the work has to be done. The worker, unlike a student in a group removed from responsibility, is unable to escape the discipline of taking some action, a circumstance which tends to accelerate the learning process.

The position of child welfare apprentice has been created for the purpose of recruiting new workers into the public child welfare field. Apprenticeship is based on a 2 year plan. The first year is used for training; 6 months or more at a school of social work and the remainder in a rural county with a limited case load, under general supervision of the training unit and with day-to-day supervision by the local supervisor. The second year consists of full-time employment in a rural public child welfare agency with continued service from the training unit. During the first
year the Department of Social Welfare pays the worker $100 a month and also pays the tuition when the worker is unable to meet this additional expense. During the second year the worker is paid by the local public welfare unit, with the usual 40 per cent reimbursement from state funds for qualified personnel.

Applicants are selected for apprenticeship with considerable care. Admissions have been chiefly college graduates who wanted to enter the field of social work, particularly child welfare, but who were without funds for additional training. An effort is made to choose those who by personality, attitude and native ability seem suited to child welfare work. In order to establish a basis for selection, the causes of failure on the part of workers in this field were analyzed, particularly those who despite assistance from the training unit, were unable to develop to the point of satisfactory performance. Three essential qualifications seemed to be: 1. Ability to consider the needs of other persons in order to establish a constructive relationship with persons in need of some kind to help; 2. Respect for the individual and his point of view; 3. Sufficient personal strength to face issues, to assume responsibility, and to take the initiative. Personality was also considered in the light of the fact that the worker is more likely to be accepted for what she is as a person than for her professional training alone. Ease of relationship, ability to give and take in conversation, vitality, warmth and responsiveness were considered most important.

The New York State training program has significance for the all important question of what social agencies can do to obtain adequate staffs. It seems to be one fairly satisfactory answer to this problem, pending the time when more universities and colleges find it possible to transcend tradition and include in their offerings professional training for all branches of the public service. In-service Development of Child Welfare Staff in New York State.—The Child, September, 1944, by Grace A. Reeder, Director, Bureau of Child Welfare, State Department of Social Welfare, New York, N. Y.

Police Administration in the Pacific Area.—Indications point toward the possibility of a Pacific Area Police Conference during the first year of the postwar period. With the economic expansion of business, transportation and communications in the Pacific area now scheduled for the postwar years, police problems will multiply. As a forum on police administration alone, such a Conference would challenge the best leadership from each country. In addition, there are a number of police problems peculiar to the Pacific area awaiting attention. A meeting of minds at the relatively neutral level of police administration would prove constructive in bringing closer together those countries bordering on the Pacific.

The One Hundredth Birthday of the Prison Association of New York.—One hundred years ago this month of December the Prison Association of New York was organized. The event was celebrated at a luncheon in New York City on December 12. The objects of the Association were immediately set forth as follows:

1. The amelioration of the condition of prisoners whether detained for trial or finally convicted or as witnesses.
2. The improvement of prison discipline and the government of prisons whether for cities, counties, or states.
3. The support and encouragement of reformed convicts after their
discharge, by affording them the means of obtaining an honest livelihood and sustaining them in their efforts at reform.

Several committees were appointed for these various purposes and the work was entered upon with admirable earnestness. It soon became clear that their efforts especially in the direction of the improvement of prison conditions would be futile if they depended for admission to the prisons upon the good will of the keepers. They sought, therefore, and succeeded in obtaining legal authority, which it was granted them in the incorporation of the Association in April, 1896. In the Act it was also required that the Association report annually to the legislature.

Through the decades the record of the Prison Association of New York has been one of honor and of value to the state. The Association was founded at a time when the rights of the prisoner and the duties of the State were very insufficiently guarded or understood. The work of the Association has been characterized not so much by a conspicuous declaration of activities as by persistent and quiet cooperation when possible with prison authorities and by consistent propaganda for the betterment of prisoners and the treatment of crime.

The forward looking measures that the Association has initiated and successfully fostered make up an impressive catalogue. The organization from its beginning has been a splendid example of public service in a democracy.