

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1946

Compulsory Military Training from the Viewpoint of the Church

Herman J. Grimm

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_grimmh@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Grimm, Herman J., "Compulsory Military Training from the Viewpoint of the Church" (1946). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 178.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/178>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

INTRODUCTION

"Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid," said Jesus to His disciples shortly before His betrayal by Judas Iscariot. Any intelligent student of history soon finds out that the peace the world gives is always a peace that causes men's hearts to be troubled and afraid. The peace of the world troubles and makes afraid

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE CHURCH

Jesus' peace is a heavenly peace. It is not an outward peace. It is an inward peace, a peace that the world gives is only an outward peace. It is often merely a cessation of hostilities.

HERMAN J.C. GRIM

Cambridge, Nebraska

May 1946

The peace Jesus gives comes from God Himself. It rests on the blood of His who made it. It was bought and paid for by the Son of God Himself. He shed His blood. He died a criminal's death on the cross that we might have this peace. It was entered in the hearts of all believers by God Himself, and He preserves it in their hearts. It is a gift which comes from the Father of every good and perfect gift. It is the product of His love, grace, and righteousness. That is why it is a certain and eternal peace. That is why the will of God who has that peace need not be troubled, nor need we be afraid.

The peace the world gives comes from human hands. It rests upon the promises of men, of whom the Bible says that all are liars. It depends upon human treaties and agreements which can easily be broken.

1 John 14:27

2 Psalm 115, 11; Romans 3:10

INTRODUCTION

"Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid", ¹ said Jesus to His disciples shortly before His betrayal by Judas Iscariot. Any intelligent student of history soon finds out that the peace the world gives is always a peace that causes men's hearts to be troubled and afraid. The peace of the world troubles and makes afraid because of the nature of that peace, and because of its givers. The peace Jesus gives is a heavenly peace. It is not an outward peace. It is an inward peace, a peace of the heart. The peace the world gives is only an outward peace. It is often merely a cessation of hostilities. The peace Jesus gives comes from God Himself. It rests on the promises of Him who cannot lie. It was bought and paid for by the Son of God Himself. He shed His blood. He died a criminal's death on the cross that men might have this peace. It was created in the hearts of all believers by God Himself; and He preserves it in their hearts. It is a gift which comes from the Giver of every good and perfect gift. It is the product of divine mercy, grace, and forgiveness. That is why it is a certain and eternal peace. That is why the child of God who has that peace need not be troubled; nor need he be afraid.

The peace the world gives comes from human beings. It rests upon the promises of men, of whom scripture says that all are liars. ² It depends upon human treaties and agreements which can easily be broken.

1 John 14,27

2 Psalm 116,11; Romans 3,4

Power-hungry conquerors often regard peace treaties as mere scraps of paper. Worldly peace often knows little of mercy or forgiveness. It is generally imposed by a powerful victor upon a beaten and powerless foe; therefore it is all too often characterized by cruelty and oppression. That is why earthly peace is so uncertain and temporary. When the weariness of war is forgotten, and a new generation arises which did not experience the misery and bloodshed of warfare, there are always those who begin to speak of the glory of war. They urge it as a means to obtain power and riches. Eager listeners to such speeches are not lacking. Black with greed and wrath, the war-clouds rise. The sunshine of peace is blotted out. A storm of death and destruction breaks upon the human race. Because the peace the world gives is based on human promises which are as uncertain as the wind and as unsteady as the waves of the sea, it always has caused the hearts of thinking men to be troubled and to be afraid.

After the greatest war history has known, we again have peace. We rejoice in it. We are glad that millions of men are no longer struggling with each other on the global battle-fields. We are relieved that death no longer rains from the skies in the form of bombs, that it no longer lurks in the torpedoes of submarine-infested waters, that our young men, the flower of our country, no longer have to give their lives by the tens of thousands to insure our survival in a world gone mad with the lust of conquest. Some who shuddered at the horrors of war now like to bury all thoughts of warfare and bloodshed in some forgotten corner of their mind. They like to bask in the sunlight of peace as if the war-

clouds would never return. But there are others who cannot forget what happened at the Marco Polo Bridge in Manchuria and at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands. They do not feel they should forget the Blitzkrieg that was so suddenly launched on the soil of Europe, and which made such frightening progress. They remember how close we were to disaster in the early days of the war which has so recently ended. They know the peace we now enjoy is like every other peace the world gives. Their hearts are already troubled and afraid. So they urge the citizens of our nation to begin now to make the proper provisions that the next war, which they say may arrive much sooner than we expect, may not find us unprepared. They would press our country to adopt a program of compulsory military training in preparation for the war that may be impending. There are others who are against such a program of compulsory military training for various reasons which seem valid and important to them.

The church, though not of the world, is inevitably in the world. Whatever happens in this world of ours generally affects the church in one way or another. So the matter of compulsory military training is also bound to have some effect upon the church and its work. If a plan of compulsory military training is adopted in our country, even if the church as such has no voice in framing the plan, it must adjust itself to it. It must make certain changes to meet the altered conditions in the life of the nation. It must make provision for the spiritual care of its members who come under the provisions of the plan. It must take advantage of any missionary opportunities which are brought into being

Plans of Compulsory Military Training

when the plan is put into operation. Therefore it is important that we discuss compulsory military training from the viewpoint of the church. We will consider the various plans which have been proposed to provide this compulsory military training for the youth of the nation. We will think out what the viewpoint of the church, of all believers in general, and of our own church body in particular, should be in regard to this matter. We will examine the relation between compulsory military training and the church. We will take note of the principal arguments before the public, and give attention to the arguments both for and against the various plans. Finally, we will suggest some steps the church should take in case compulsory military training is instituted in our country, also some steps our church should take while it is waiting for the matter to be decided.

16, 1875 that "all able-bodied effective men, between 16 and 50 years of age, be formed into companies of militia". In Revolutionary times, the militia system was the only defense system in our country. It served fairly well for local defense; but since the periods of duty were seldom more than three to six months, and the members were constitutionally undisciplined and untrained, the militia was practically useless for military expeditions outside the country, or even the locality, in which the members lived. General George Washington, who was forced to depend on the militia during the Revolutionary War, did not have much use for the system. He tried to get a better system adopted

CHAPTER ONE

for the defense Plans of Compulsory Military Training

The United States continued to struggle along with the militia system for many years. In the year of 1800, the failure of the militia was evident at Detroit, at Greenpoint, New York, and at Indiana. 527,000 militia troops could not keep 18,000 British regulars from capturing Washington and burning the White House. It was clearly seen that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a portion of his property, but even of his personal services, to the defense of it.¹ The first colonists of our land had brought with them the English concept of the militia. This required that all able-bodied men hold themselves available for military service in case of an emergency. There was even an occasional period of training given. Adopting the principle of militia service, the Continental Congress recommended in July 18, 1775 that "all able-bodied effective men, between 16 and 50 years of age, be formed into companies of militia".¹ In Revolutionary times, the militia system was the only defense system in our country. It served fairly well for local defense; but since the periods of duty were seldom more than three to six months, and the members were constitutionally undisciplined and untrained, the militia was practically useless for military expeditions outside the country, or even the locality, in which the members lived. General George Washington, who was forced to depend on the militia during the Revolutionary War, did not have much use for the system. He tried to get a better system adopted

¹ Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 8

withed only a fraction of the manpower it should have produced.

for the defense of the nation; but he was not successful.

The United States continued to struggle along with the militia system for many years. In the War of 1812, the failure of the militia was evident at Detroit, at Queenstown Heights, and at Bladenburg. 527,000 militia troops could not keep 16,500 British regulars from capturing Washington and burning the White House. Of course we finally won the war, as we won the Revolutionary War, when it took 420,000 militia to defeat 42,000 British regulars; but the war would have ended much sooner if we would have had a better defense system. In the Mexican War in 1845, we had similar trouble with the militia. The troops were better trained and equipped then; but at the height of General Scott's march on Mexico City, 40,000 troops went home because their year of enlistment was over. General Scott had to wait for forty per-cent replacements for his armies before he could continue his victory march.

In the Civil War, the militia was finally replaced by a system of compulsory military duty and service. At the start of the war, President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers for three months of service was a failure. When the Confederacy called its men for one year, and then, before the end of the year, instituted universal military conscription, Congress no longer had a choice. It was forced to pass the draft act of March 3, 1863 to get a supply of manpower for the Union armies. This first draft act was a very poor measure. Because exemptions could be purchased for \$300 and substitutes could be hired, there was a great deal of corruption and violence in its administration. It yielded only a fraction of the manpower it should have produced.

Meanwhile universal conscription had become the accepted method of getting manpower for military purposes in most European countries. As early as 1798, France called upon all able-bodied men between 20 and 25 years of age to serve in its army. Universal conscription became the established military policy in practically all the European nations after 1870. Prussia early developed the system to its full worth as a peacetime military policy. When its armed force was limited to 42,000 by the Tilsit Treaty of July 1807, the military genius Scharnhorst evolved a plan of training for short periods of compulsory service which was gladly adopted by his government. The large reserve of trained manpower produced in Prussia showed its effectiveness in 1813 when the war with Napoleon was renewed. Because of its proven success, Scharnhorst's plan was further developed by Von Boyen, another Prussian military expert. As a result of his work, the first scientific military law for universal peacetime service was passed on September 3, 1814. The efficiency of the Prussian military machine which resulted was proved against Denmark (in 1864), against Austria (in 1866), and against Napoleon III (in 1870).

One after another, most other European countries adopted Prussia's plan. Austria adopted it in 1868; Greece, in 1869; France, in 1872; Russia, in 1874; and Italy, in 1875. Rumania adopted it as early as 1866. By the time World War I was unleashed upon a dissatisfied and heavily-armed world, the only great European power which did not have a large body of citizen-soldiers conscripted in peacetime was Great Britain.

Britain had never followed the example of her continental neighbors because she depended on her large and powerful navy for protection.

The reason the United States and Great Britain never adopted a peacetime program of universal military conscription is probably due to the geographical and political factors involved. As John Dickensen ably sums it up: "A people will not willingly submit to the obvious economic waste of elaborate military training unless the dominant public opinion among them is habituated to regard large-scale warfare as an ever-present possibility and normal incident of national life Rival nations crowding each other geographically and laboring under the fear of impending over-population accepted whole-heartedly a tradition of national antagonisms."²

When nation after nation was drawn into World War I, even those nations which had not practiced peacetime universal conscription, found it necessary to institute universal wartime conscription. Great Britain could not get enough manpower by means of voluntary enlistment; so it passed a draft act in 1914. Our own country, soon after its entrance into the war, adopted a system of universal conscription. The act, passed by Congress on May 18, 1917, called for all young men between 21 and 31 years for the duration of the war. The only outright exemptions granted were for ministers, divinity students, and a few high political officials. Conscientious objectors were exempted from combat service only. There were also provisions made for exemptions at presidential discretion for essential occupations and dependency.

After the armistice was signed at the close of the first world war,

² Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science; September 1945 - page 9

Great Britain reverted to the voluntary principle of military training and service. The United States also demobilized its army and navy without continuing universal military service or training. At the Versailles peace-table it was proposed to outlaw all peacetime compulsory military service; but the proposal was soon rejected. France opposed it strongly; and the other nations did not press the point. Germany was prohibited from enacting any laws calling for peacetime military training; and its armed forces were sharply limited. But the victorious continental European nations gave universal peacetime compulsory military training a prominent place on their national agenda.

In March 16, 1935, Adolph Hitler arbitrarily removed Germany's restrictions in regard to conscription; and the new Reichswehr was born. On April 27, 1939, Great Britain, threatened by war, adopted universal conscription and began training its manpower. On September 16, 1940, our own country, fearing it would be involved in a second world war which had already begun in Europe, passed its first universal peacetime military training act, known as: "The Selective Training and Service Act". Several attempts had been made previous to this time to introduce compulsory military training in peacetime; but they had not been successful.

As early as August 3, 1919, Secretary of War Newton Baker had called for a bill to establish a three month training period for every 18 and 19 year old youth in the country. As a result of his pleas, the Kahn-Chamberlin bill was submitted to Congress. This bill called for a training period of six months followed by five years in which the trainees were

subject to additional training periods, if that were deemed necessary. This bill was defeated. A year later, a national defense act was proposed. This provided for a compulsory military training period of four months for the 19 year-olds of the nation. The trainees were then to be enrolled as organized reserves for five years. When the National Defense Act of 1920 was finally passed, these compulsory provisions had been replaced by voluntary ones because the sentiment of the country was against compulsory military training at the time. However, six years later, a "Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee" was created to develop a plan which could be used to quickly build up an adequate army, navy, and airforce in case of an emergency. This committee made arrangements for reserve commissions in the army and in the navy. It planned correspondence courses and two-week conferences for reserve officers. It also planned the procedure that was later used to draft men under the Selective Training and Service Act. According to this act, no more than 900,000 men were to be in training at one time. The training period was to be one year or less. The nation's manpower was divided into four classes: Class I -- men for the services; Class II -- men for civilian activities; Class III -- men with dependents; and Class IV -- political officials deferred by law, ministers, the mentally, physically, and morally unfit, and miscellaneous other groups. ve for six years after training.

When we entered the second world war, this act was soon changed to fit war conditions. The restriction on the number of men to train at one time was lifted. The term of training was lengthened to the duration plus six months. The age limit was raised to include older men and low-

ered to include younger men. A powerful war machine of upwards of 12,000,000 men was raised, trained, equipped, and maintained in battle.

The end of the war started the demobilization process. A point system was constructed. 12 points were granted to all married men. 12 additional points were granted for every dependent child. One point was granted for every month of service. One additional point was given for every month of service overseas. Points were also given for certain military decorations. Millions of our soldiers, sailors, and aviators have been demobilized according to this point system.

When they saw their armed forces melt away under the point system, the military leaders became alarmed. They appealed to President Truman. The president studied the problem; and on October 23, 1945, he asked for a compulsory military training bill with no strings attached. He wanted twelve months in camp for every physically able boy upon reaching the age of eighteen or upon graduation from high school, or, in any case, before he was twenty years old. Mr. Truman proposed that no exemption be made for occupation or dependents, that combat fitness be not made a necessary qualification, that trainees should also be made ready to perform militarily valuable jobs in addition to actual fighting, that the emphasis be placed on modern instruments of warfare, and that the trained men become part of the general reserve for six years after training.

When President Truman stated his requirements, several plans had already been suggested. One of the first of these was a plan suggested by a certain Griscom Morgan in a letter to the "Times" which was dated March 31, 1944. Morgan's plan was modeled on the military training of

the Swiss. His plan called for from four to six months a year, depending on the rank and the branch of service.³

Another plan had been suggested by General George C. Marshall on September 2, 1944.⁴ This plan called for a non-professional peacetime trained force which would be outside of state control and fully organized, manned, and staffed in peacetime in the form in which it would be used in war. In this armed force, the key positions would be occupied by trained civilian officers instead of suddenly elevated professionals, as was so often the case in this war.

Then there was always George Washington's plan of January 21, 1790, which was a revision of an earlier plan by Henry Knox. Knox's plan had called for six weeks of training a year for three successive years.

⁵ Washington's plan called for thirty days in camp every year for two years, and ten days additional in the third year. He planned that every youth between 18 and 20 years of age should take part in such training.

Before the House of Representatives and the Senate were two identical bills: * H.R. 515, known as the "May Bill", which had been introduced on January 3, 1945 and referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs, and S. 188, known as the "Gurney Bill", which was submitted to

3 Education, October 1945 - page 69

4 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 13

5 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 12

* Often referred to as the "Gurney-May Bill"

the Senate on January 10, 1945. Both bills were worded thus: "A Bill To provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby declares that the reservoir of trained manpower built up at such enormous expense during the present war should not be permitted to become empty again as after World War I, but should be perpetuated for the peace and security of future generations. (b) That Congress further declares that this end can be assured only through a system of military training for all able-bodied citizens in their early manhood. While the details of future military organization cannot be determined with precision until after the terms of a permanent peace can be envisaged, there can be no thoroughly effective national defense system that does not rest upon the democratic principle that all citizens of a free state should be trained to defend their country. (c) That Congress further declares that the training system should be inaugurated as soon as practicable after the cessation of hostilities in order to utilize material resources and training experience which will otherwise soon be dissipated. Section 2. Under such regulations as the President shall prescribe, every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing therein shall, upon attaining the age of 18 years, or within 4 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 a-

lone, for a period of one year, except persons as shall be serving in the armed forces at the time this section takes effect, such exception to be under regulations to be prescribed by the President for the exemptions of such persons by reason of service with the armed forces. The period of training shall be one year, less such time, not exceeding one month, as may be reasonably necessary for induction, mobilization, and demobilization: Provided, That any person subject to training under the provisions of this Act shall have the privilege of electing in such manner and at such time as may be prescribed by regulation, whether such training shall begin when he attains the age of 18 years, or whether it be deferred for not more than 4 years, and of expressing whether he desires to be trained in the Army or the Navy, and, so far as practicable, he shall be trained in accordance with such expressed desire: Provided, however, That any person who has been graduated by a preparatory or high school may, after his seventeenth birthday, elect with the consent of his parents or of persons standing in loco parentis to be inducted before his eighteenth birthday: And provided further, That during the period of training prescribed in this section, it shall be the duty of all officers charged with the training to select and record the names of all trainees who show capacity for leadership with a view to encouraging them to qualify as reserve noncommissioned officers and officers during their period of enrollment as reservists under the provisions of section 3 of this Act. (1) The date of a proclamation

Section 3. Each young man after the completion of his training under section 2 shall be enrolled as a reservist in the land or naval forces

of the United States for a period of 6 years, but shall not be subject to compulsory military service during that period except in an emergency declared by Congress and then only under such conditions as Congress may prescribe. Provided, That any man who completes his training under section 2 and who thereafter serves satisfactorily as a volunteer in the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Regular Army for a period of at least one year, or in the National Guard of the United States or the Naval Militia for a period of at least 2 years, or in an organized reserve unit for a period of at least 3 years, shall be deemed to have completed the 6 year period as a reservist prescribed in this section, but nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any such man, while in the National Guard of the United States or the Naval Militia from being ordered or called to active duty therein by appropriate Act of Congress.

Section 4. After the period of reserve enrollment prescribed in section 3 no man shall be subject to compulsory military service except when the Congress shall have declared a national emergency requiring such service, and then only under such conditions as the Congress may prescribe.

Section 5. Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this Act, or regulations made pursuant thereto, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Section 6. This Act shall become effective six months after whichever of the following dates is the earlier: (1) The date of a proclamation by the President that the war is ended, or (2) the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Section 7. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

Section 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Military Training Act of 1945".

Among the substitutions, changes, and amendments to this bill is a plan proposed by Albert R. Brinkman, an infantry captain. His suggested period of training, inspired by the Swiss military training system, is a four month basic training period with twenty-four hour days of duty at some military training center. The program for this period would comprise basic courses in military courtesy and discipline, interior guard duty, first aid and personal hygiene, defense against chemical attack, map reading and the use of the compass, individual protective measures, care of equipment and clothing, tent pitching, the manual of arms, basic weapons, and basic tactics. This training would occupy three of the four months. For the last month he planned specialization in one of the basic branches. If the trainee wanted to train for a longer period of time in his specialty, he could be allowed to do so. Allowances could be made for individual differences in training, such as special training in light of a vocation and development of aptitudes for post-training life. Different branches of the army or navy would probably want to offer extra periods of training. The plan made provision for limited service capabilities in branches which do not require a high standard of physical fitness. It required a standard training program throughout

the country and a well-developed, unbiased testing bureau to apportion and guide the trainees into appropriate branches. The courses and programs were to be prescribed by the War Department. It was planned to use officers and enlisted men who had served in the army as training personnel, also the camps and training areas which had been used during the war. The personnel was to be paid by state and federally matched salaries. To insure a supply of instructors, teacher-training institutions would probably have to introduce courses on principles of military education. Surplus equipment, supplies, weapons, and even uniforms, could be used for the trainees. They should be paid \$25 per month.

A section of the plan suggested naval training for girls in coastal states with naval training centers. For others, present training center installations for women's branches of the service could be used. Girls would not be compelled to take the training; but could enlist voluntarily for it.

Other suggestions were; to give regular instructors permanent rank in the army or navy, to give trainees opportunity to become non-commissioned or petty officers with a corresponding increase in pay, to offer a certificate of military training for a basic period satisfactorily completed, and to issue a card which contained the information in regard to the courses taken and the ratings given. The plan provided that all those who planned to go to a college which had a recognized senior military training unit would be exempt from the compulsory period of training. Four years of college training plus a summer camp would be considered tantamount to the regular period. The plan also suggested that the

following possibilities be offered to trainees who satisfactorily completed the prescribed term of service: entrance into the regular army or some other branch of the service, entrance to advanced training courses, entrance to advanced military training upon entering college, entrance to officer candidate schools, entrance to the air corps, entrance to programs similar to the ASTP or V-12, or entrance to the United States Military or Naval Academy.

Another substitute to the plan proposed by the Gurney-May bill is military training through the National Guard. Such training, as proposed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars through Omar B. Ketchum, their national legislative representative, would take the place of the bitterly opposed one year under army and navy direction. The training under the National Guard would take place over a period of years in the home communities of the trainees. It would leave them at home, with their families, and their opportunities to continue their education without interruption. There would be regular periods of training each week at the local armory, and two weeks each summer at a reserve camp. There would be 116 days of military training over a period of two years. This would be followed by refresher courses from time to time. Many facilities for such training are already available. There is a supply of training personnel and equipment. Armories could be built in the smaller communities where they are not yet in existence. The cost of the plan would be

added to the Gurney-May bill. This addition to the first section --

(3) The Congress further declares that said training system is for
7 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - pages 138-143

far less than the one advocated by the Gurney-May bill.

A third substitute is the so-called "Legion Plan". This plan came as a result of the hearings before the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy in June 1945 and the president's message to Congress on October 23, 1945. The American Legion, meeting in Chicago, Illinois in November 1945, gave consideration both to the hearings and the message of the president, and adopted these resolutions: "RESOLVED, That the Congress be urged to enact immediately a universal military training law to be administered by a civilian authority and specifically providing for a twelve months' period of required training which shall consist of a period of adequate basic training, common to all trainees, and a remaining period, either in advanced technical or scientific training, upon qualification therefor; or its equivalent in the regular establishments or the civilian components of the armed forces, or in advanced R.O.T.C.'s, all of which training shall be under the general direction of the regular establishment of the armed forces; and be it further "RESOLVED, That the induction for such training shall be at the age of 18 years, or upon graduation from high school -- whichever is later; but in any event before his 20th birthday, and that the basic training shall, if practicable, be at a facility in close proximity to the trainee's home."

The National Commander, upon behalf of the American Legion, later presented to the House Military Affairs Committee, the following amendments to the Gurney-May bill: This addition to the first section -- "(d) The Congress further declares that said training system is for the training of civilians to create a trained citizen reserve to the

armed services in time of national crisis and that the administration of this Act shall be under the Military Training Board composed of civilians hereinafter created." An entirely new second section: "Section 2. Under such provisions as follow, every male citizen of the United States and every male alien residing therein shall, upon attaining the age of 18 years, be subject to military, naval, or air training, by the respective armed forces, and shall be called into the service of the United States, for this purpose alone, for a period of one year, except such persons as shall have served in the armed forces of the United States for a period of not less than three months; Provided, That any person subject to training under the provisions of this Act shall have the privilege of electing, in such manner and at such time as may be prescribed by regulation, whether such training shall begin when he attains the age of eighteen years or upon his graduation from high school, whichever is later; but in any event before his twentieth birthday, and of expressing whether he desires to train for the army, navy, or air, and, so far as practicable, he shall be trained in accordance with such expressed desire; Provided, however, that any person who has been graduated by a preparatory or high school may, after his seventeenth birthday, elect, with the consent of his parents or persons standing in loco parentis, to be called before his eighteenth birthday; Provided, further, that the one year of training shall be divided into two periods. The FIRST PERIOD shall be four (4) months, beginning as near as possible on June 1 of each year, and shall include basic training. Officers from the civilian components shall be assigned all duties which they can perform

effectively. The SECOND PERIOD will be eight (8) months or longer, beginning about October 1 of each year, and the trainee will choose one of the following options, within required quotas: (1) If qualified, he may attend a college or university, where he will be required to enroll in and complete the advanced course of the R.O.T.C., and an additional training period, preferably during the summer months; (2) or he may enlist in the National Guard for a period of three years, or an organized unit of the Organized Reserve Corps for a period of three years; (3) or, if qualified, he may, if selected, pursue advanced technical or basic scientific training which may be given in the armed forces, in industry or in a college or university; (4) or he may continue his advanced training under supervision of the regular establishment of the armed forces; (5) or he may enlist in the regular forces for a normal enlistment period; and Provided further, that during the period of training prescribed in this section, it shall be the duty of all officers charged with the training to select and record the names of all trainees who show capacity for leadership with a view to encouraging them to qualify as reserve noncommissioned officers and officers." Leaving only this part of section three: "each young man after the completion of his training under section 2 shall be enrolled as a reservist in the land or naval forces of the United States for a period of six years, but shall not be subject to compulsory military service during that period except in an emergency declared by the Congress and then only under such conditions as the Congress may prescribe."

According to the Legion plan, the young men of the nation, at the

age of 18 or upon graduation from high school or preparatory school, which ever is later, will enter the armed forces of the United States for training only. In no case shall the period of training be postponed until after the twentieth birthday. The training is to be planned and supervised by a civilian commission created by Congress and selected by the president. The armed forces will do the training. The civilian authorities will plan and establish the regulations governing the conduct and disciplinary provisions for the trainees. Only those suffering from extreme physical or mental handicaps will be exempted from the training. Every possible hour of the day will be used. There will be a minimum of time off. The only leaves will be emergency leaves. The training will be done as near the homes of the trainees as possible. There will be two periods; the basic, individual, and individual in the unit training for four months, and the advanced training for eight months, or its equivalent. The trainee will be allowed to choose the branch of the armed forces in which he is to be trained as much as that is possible within the quota for the branch. After basic training, the trainee may, upon selection by ability and election, take part in a training period for advanced specialists or technicians; or he may return home and accept further military training in organized reserve or national guard units; or he may enter a college or university that has an R.O.T.C. unit, and complete that training plus field training during certain summer months; or he may volunteer for a term of enlistment in the regular army, navy, or marine corps; or he may complete a year of training with the armed forces along the lines provided by them. The training will be

done by civilian officers, graduates of an R.O.T.C. or an officer candidates' school, and by candidates for an officer's commission. There will also be a program in the scientific universities to provide trained men in the sciences for special duty in scientific research and development, production, procurement and the professions, all of whom will understand the needs of the armed services. The rate of pay for the trainees and the family and dependency allowances will be set by Congress. Army insurance can be offered to the trainees for their period of service. The cost of the plan will be far less than other proposed plans which are really efficient in providing military training.

Among other suggestions is the one made by Raymond Moley shortly after the president's speech to Congress in regard to compulsory military training. Mr. Moley commented that the training should be strictly military, and that no attempt should be made to interweave it with high school and college programs. He also said that the indoctrination of the trainees should be rigidly supervised by non-political and non-military educators. He further stated that the proposed year of training should not be turned into a school of uplift, entertainment, or political or economic propaganda. The only purpose should be to train men in the science of war and to provide the medical and moral care essential thereto.

8 Quotations and other information in regard to the Legion plan taken from a booklet published by the American Legion and entitled: "the American Legion presents Common Sense Security"

9 Newsweek, November 5, 1945 - page 120

In the February 9, 1946 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, Henry Steele Comager wrote about the "confusion and fractional thinking" of the army, navy, and the airforces in their plans and proposals. He claimed the answers were not to be found in the arguments of military and naval experts. He advocated a plan formulated by civilian, not military, authorities. He said we must adjust our military to the scientific and industrial potential, and all these to the temper and character of the American people. There must be a logical and coherent plan directed to the prevention of war. We must start with the right habits and create the right precedents.

General Eisenhower stated in July 1945 that there should be three main purposes in peacetime military training: technical training, physical hardening, and psychological and moral training. The main objective should be the psychological and moral training. This requires the longest time; but it is never completely forgotten.

Secretary of War Patterson offered the following four "planks of peace": 1. a single department of armed forces under a unified command; 2. a democratic and scientific system of military training which will fit our youth both for citizenship and the national defense; 3. a plan for swift industrial mobilization that will permit complete and immediate

10 The Atlantic Monthly, February 9, 1946 - page 54

11 The Atlantic Monthly, February 9, 1946 - page 58

12 The Christian Century, July 25, 1945 - page 854

13 Colliers Magazine, November 24, 1945 - page 59

conversion to a war footing when attack becomes imminent; 4. scientific research and engineering that will continue to give our forces the most effective offensive and defensive weapons.

A.E. Morgan, in an article in the February 1946 American Mercury,¹⁴ offered the following proposal: 1 postpone action to study the subject by a commission of leaders of industry, agriculture, labor, the church, education, and Congress; 2 the policy to be formulated by this commission should be controlled by a similar commission, having overall supervision; 3 West Point should be reorganized as a graduate school, receiving men of greater maturity, having all except explicitly military faculty members drawn from other institutions; 4 America should study most carefully the conditions necessary for peace, and not only the conditions necessary for waging war.

Brigadier General Walter L. Weible, director of military training, Army Service Forces, has advocated universal military training as a part of the post-war educational program in our schools and colleges.

Dr. William Mather Lewis, president of Lafayette College, urged six months of military training combined with citizenship studies for girls as well as boys.

Hajo Holborn, history professor of Yale University, suggested that 24 to 26 weeks should be adequate, that retraining will be necessary in case of war, and that the use of half a year for training will be less

¹⁴ The American Mercury, February 1946 - page 167 and 168

¹⁵ Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 130

costly to the country's economy than a full year. Ernest A. Wilkins, president of Oberlin College, suggested an "over-¹⁶all plan of national defense" instead of just a year of military training for "everyone". He suggested military strength adequate in quantity, in quality, and in its overall unification; sufficient scientific and inventive activities to keep us in possession of the most advanced weapons; medical and related professions adequate in quantity and quality, and linked, in so far as necessary, to the program of national defense; an industrial organization also linked to the defense program; and internal unity of a degree so high that men and women generally will participate actively in any national defense program, and to save us from internal cleavages that would lessen or nullify our strength in time of danger.

The army plans carry out the provisions of the Gurney-May bill. The army intends to use all the men in the age group who are physically and mentally able to undertake the training and to assume the responsibility for national defense. It plans to conduct the training on military establishments by military men. The trainees will be used for training purposes only. They will not be used for military operations unless Congress passes an act declaring an emergency. The training will be intensive and extensive, the purpose being to equip men to engage in future wars. It will be constantly revised to meet new conditions. It

¹⁶ Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - pages 132-137 (Quotation - "over-all plan of national defense" - taken from title of article, page 131)

will be based on the experience gained in the last war. Recruit training will be followed by individual technical training. Then the men will be trained to act as members of a team. The emphasis will be on developing leaders and a reserve of specialists and technicians. Every effort will be made to develop and use the skills of the trainees. There will be classification and aptitude tests to determine what the trainees can be expected to do. The men will be called into service under a procedure similar to selective service. The camps will be placed largely in the southern part of the country. The trainees will be given initial physical examinations; and minor physical corrections will be made. They will be assigned to work commensurate with their physical ability. The men will live in permanent posts, in clean airy barracks. The instructors will be drawn largely from the Officers Reserve Corps. The trainees will get nourishing food. They will receive physical training of various types. Medical and dental care will be provided. There will also be religious opportunities. Sports, entertainment, and cultural opportunities will be provided for off-duty hours. During recruit training the usual basis military subjects will be taught. Some of these are: dismounted drill and ceremonies, map and aerial photo readings, equipment and clothing care, tent pitching, extended order drill, interior guard duty, marches and bivouacs, military courtesy, discipline, articles of war, sanitation, first aid, personal and sex hygiene, motor movements, physical training, use of the compass, use of rations, use of weapons, etc. The recruit training will be followed by technical training in some specialty. After this will come u-

nit training in small units, then unit training in large units, and finally field exercises in which air, ground, service, and navy forces will combine. The recruit training will last nine weeks. The specialized training will take from nine to twenty-six weeks, depending on the specialty. The trainees will be assigned to a small unit during a part or all of this time. For 13 weeks he will study the workings of a larger unit. The final eight weeks will be spent in combined maneuvers. ¹⁷

The navy plans four phases of training. Phase number one concerns recruit training -- terminology of the service, rudiments of seafaring, drill, elements of military discipline, basic health and stamina training, and extra-curricular activities. In the third month of this training, the trainees will be selected for further training in some specialty. This selection will be based on written and oral aptitude tests. The preferences of the individuals will be honored within the limits of the capacity of the individual and the numbers needed in each rating. The second phase calls for thirteen weeks at navy class "A" schools, learning one of more than one hundred skills. Phase number three is the operational phase. It provides for training as the crew of a battleship, a carrier, or some other naval vessel. The final phase consists of a thirteen week period in ships or naval aircraft carrying out tactical problems, and taking part in combined maneuvers. ¹⁸

17 Information in regard to the army plans taken from a booklet prepared to supplement War Department testimony before Congress and entitled: "Universal Military Training"

18 Vital Speeches of the Day, July 1, 1945 - pages 559-561

In addition to these training plans, the War Department has made
19
the following recommendations for the post-war military establishment:
that the establishment consist of a regular army and navy, a national
guard, and the organized army and navy reserves; that there be an ade-
quate and sensitive military intelligence; that there be an efficient
and practical scheme for industrial mobilization; and that there be an
adequate program of military research and development. The universal
peacetime compulsory military training program of the armed services
is therefore only a part of the whole plan; but the armed forces con-
sider it to be a very important part, a part that should not be dis-
pensed with.

19 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Sep-
tember 1945 - page 33

world, that I should hear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of
the truth heareth my voice." The viewpoint of the church should be
based upon the truth. If we ask, like Pilate, "What is truth?", Jesus
also has an answer for this question. For He tells us: "If ye continue
in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth,
and the truth shall make you free." The truth upon which the church
should base its viewpoint is therefore, the word of God. This word of
God is recorded in the Bible, of which we are told that it is all given
by inspiration of God, and that it is "profitable for doctrine, for re-

1 John 18,33

2 John 18,36

3 John 18,37

4 John 18,38

5 John 8,31-32

CHAPTER TWO

The Viewpoint of the Church

What should the church's viewpoint be in regard to these various plans of compulsory military training? When our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of the church, was on trial before Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor of Palestine, that unjust and unscrupulous judge asked Him, "Art Thou the King of the Jews?"¹ The answer Jesus gave to Pilate on this occasion indicated what the viewpoint of the church should be. Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."² When Pilate asked Him again, "Art Thou a king then?", Jesus answered him, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice."³ The viewpoint of the church should be based upon the truth. If we ask, like Pilate, "What is truth?", Jesus also has an answer for this question. For He tells us: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."⁴ The truth upon which the church should base its viewpoint is therefore, the word of God. This word of God is recorded in the Bible, of which we are told that it is all given by inspiration of God, and that it is "profitable for doctrine, for re-

1 John 18,33

2 John 18,36

3 John 18,37

4 John 18,38

5 John 8,31&32

proof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."⁶

Basing its viewpoint on the scriptures, the church finds it has no right to govern or rule the people of the world. It has no authority to make laws, to collect taxes, to wage wars, or to carry out any of the other functions of earthly rulers. Jesus pointed this out when He told His disciples: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."⁷ He also called attention to this when He told Peter to sheathe his sword at the gate of the Garden of Gethsemane when Judas, the traitor, appeared. He likewise indicated it when He pointed out that not "lordship" but "service" should spell greatness among His disciples.⁸ He clearly taught it when He told Pilate that His kingdom is not of this world. The real business of the church is clearly described in these words of Jesus: "Go ye therefore, and teach (make disciples of) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."⁹ Thus the business of the church is to teach, not to rule. It is an educational agency, a disciple-making organization. It has authority only over its disciples; and it rules them, not by force, but by the teachings of God's word.

The government is a ruling agency. Its duty is to govern all those who are placed within its borders by God. It has the right to use the

6 II Timothy 3,16&17

7 Matthew 22,21

8 John 18,11

9 Luke 22,24-26

10 Matthew 28,19&20

14 John 18,36

sword, the power of punishment, the authority to inflict the death penalty. It has the right to collect tribute or taxes; for God has arranged it that the government should support itself in this way. It has the right to make laws or ordinances, and to enforce them. It has the right to control the earthly matters which concern its subjects or citizens, to control the relations between the individual and society, as long as its laws and regulations do not conflict with those which God has made. It can forbid some of the things which God has not forbidden; but it cannot allow what God has not allowed. If there is a conflict between what the government says and what God says, the believer must, of course, obey God.

So scripture points out that the government has its function and work, and church has its function and work; and that their function and work are not one and the same; but that they are separate and distinct. The church should not attempt to do the work of the government; and the government should not attempt to do the work of the church.

Now where does compulsory military training fit in? Is it a function of the government or a function of the church? Since it is connected with the sword, with waging war, it is clearly not a function of the church. It is solely and alone a function of the government, as Jesus pointed out when He told Pilate: "If my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from thence."

11 Romans 13,1-7
12 I Peter 2,13&14
13 Acts 5,29
14 John 18,36

So it is not up to the church to plan military training. It is not the business of the church to make plans for the military education of the citizens of our country, and to insist that they be adopted. It is not even the business of the church to suggest plans for the military training of the youth of our country. Nor is it up to the church to decide whether our country should have compulsory military training in peacetime or in wartime. These are political matters. They are the concern of the government. They cannot be classed under the spiritual matters which are the concern of the church. The government should make its military plans without pressure from the church. It should decide whether military training should be compulsory or not.

Only when the military program planned and administered by the government adversely affects the work of the church or its members does the church have a right to object. For instance, if a plan of compulsory military training were adopted which interfered with the education of the pastors or teachers of the church in such a way that a real hardship would result to the church, the church could protest to the government and ask that the plan be modified to remove the objection. If the government refused to modify the plan, the church would have to make the best of it. The church could not refuse to cooperate unless the government asked its members to do something which God has forbidden. If the government did that, the church would be forced to obey God rather than human beings.

Has God forbidden compulsory military training? Some pacifist churches claim He has. They look upon war as "mass murder". They claim

all wars are wrong, and all participation in war (which naturally includes all preparation for war) is a sin. Can the church object to compulsory military training, or for that matter, any military training, on such grounds? Scripture answers this question for us when it points out that every soul (every person) should be subject to the higher (superior) powers. The Bible tells us that every government is ordained of God, that only those governments can exist which God, according to His purposes, allows to exist. Anyone who resists the government (except when it commands disobedience to God), resists an ordinance, or law, of God; for God has commanded obedience to the government in everything in which the government is placed over us. The penalty of disobedience to our established government is damnation. One of the things in which the government has the right to command its citizens is in waging war. For the word of God tells us that the government does not bear the sword in vain; and the "sword" is the power over life and death. The government has this power over its own citizens. It also has this power over any who threaten its existence. It has the authority from God to use the sword to protect its rights and the rights of its citizens against all evil-doers. In protecting its rights and the rights of its citizens, the government has the authority to call upon any or all of its citizens for their help. If this help includes fighting in a war (or training to fight in a war), it is the duty of citizens to obey their government.

15 Romans 13,1

16 Romans 13,2

17 Romans 13,4

They should be willing to wound, or even kill, the enemy at the command of their government. If the government feels there is danger of a war, it has the right to maintain a standing army. It has the right to call upon all of its citizens to train and to serve in its army, navy, or any other type of armed forces.

Christians who are citizens of a country are in duty bound to answer their country's call when it requires them to serve in its armed forces. As individuals, Christians have no right to use the sword. Their Lord has told them not to kill, or even to hurt or harm their neighbor in any way. They have been taught to turn the left cheek to those who smite them on the right. If anyone sues them at law and takes away their coat, they should let him have their cloak also. They have been cautioned not to avenge themselves, but rather to give place to wrath. They should love their enemies, and bless those who curse them. But when Christians use the sword in war, when they take the lives of their country's enemies, they are not acting as individuals. They are acting as representatives of their government which has the right from God Himself to be a revenger to execute wrath upon evil-doers.

The only time a Christian has the right to refuse his country's call to serve in its armed forces is when he knows that his country is not executing wrath upon evil-doers. If he is sure his country is waging an unjust war, he must, of course, refuse to serve. Whether a war is

spoken for or against compulsory military training. They have a right to

18 Matthew 5,39 persuade others 19 Romans 12,9 thinking. They have a

20 Matthew 5,44 the proposed plans, to make suggestions, and to sub-

just or unjust is generally very hard to establish, however. Modern international relations are very complex. There are numerous conditions and factors to be known and understood. In wartime especially there is so much propaganda issued it is hard to decide what is fact and what is fiction. Under such conditions, if a Christian does not know, or is in doubt, he is in duty bound to obey his government and support its war effort. Only if he is absolutely sure that the war waged by his government is beyond question an unjust war does he have the right to refuse his government's call to arms.

Because of these teachings of scripture, the church does not have the right to object to compulsory military training because it is a preparation for war. The church could only object if a plan of compulsory military training were adopted which would render impossible its soul-saving and soul-keeping work, or would even seriously hinder it. Then the church could and should object, and should bring its objections before the proper authorities.

This does not mean that church members should not discuss the proposed plans for compulsory military training. It does not mean they should all be neutral and speak neither for nor against the system or any of the plans which have been suggested. Church members can be, and generally are, citizens of the country in which they live. In our nation they have a voice in the government. As citizens, they have a right to speak for or against compulsory military training. They have a right to make attempts to persuade others to their way of thinking. They have a right to criticize the proposed plans, to make suggestions, and to sub-

mit changes which they feel would improve the plans now before the public. But they should do all this as citizens of the country, and

not as church members; for such things are in the realm of the political, not in the realm of the spiritual.

Although the church, as such, should not dictate to the state what plans of military training should be adopted, whether any plans should be adopted or not, or when action should be taken, the church is bound to be profoundly affected by any plans of compulsory military training which become the law of the land. For, although the church can and should escape being of the world, it cannot escape being in the world. Since it is inevitably in the world, it is affected by what goes on in the world. Some things affect the church but little. Others affect it a great deal.

No matter which plan of compulsory military training is adopted, both the professional and lay-members of the church will be affected to some extent. If the policy of no occupational exemptions is followed, both theological and pedagogical students will be subject to a year of military training. This will affect the education of our pastors and teachers. If the plan of the army and navy is followed, they will be under strictly military control for a year. If the Legion plan is followed, they will be under military control for at least four months. For the remaining eight months it may be possible to arrange for N.O.T.C., N.R.O.T.C., or A.N.O.T.C. training in our church colleges, so that they may continue their education with the least possible interruption. If the basic training of our ministerial and educational students can be arranged for the summer months, as the Legion plan proposed, one school year would need to be shortened only by one month. Then the education

CHAPTER THREE

The Relation between Compulsory Military Training and the Church

Although the church, as such, should not dictate to the state what plans of military training should be adopted, whether any plans should be adopted or not, or when action should be taken, the church is bound to be profoundly affected by any plans of compulsory military training which become the law of the land. For, although the church can and should escape being of the world, it cannot escape being in the world. Since it is inevitably in the world, it is affected by what goes on in the world. Some things affect the church but little. Others affect it a great deal.

No matter which plan of compulsory military training is adopted, both the professional and lay-members of the church will be affected to some extent. If the policy of no occupational exemptions is followed, both theological and pedagogical students will be subject to a year of military training. This will affect the education of our pastors and teachers. If the plan of the army and navy is followed, they will be under strictly military control for a year. If the Legion plan is followed, they will be under military control for at least four months. For the remaining eight months it may be possible to arrange for R.O.T.C., N.R.O.T.C., or A.R.O.T.C. training in our church colleges, so that they may continue their education with the least possible interruption. If the basic training of our ministerial and educational students can be arranged for the summer months, as the Legion plan proposed, one school year would need to be shortened only by one month. Then the education

of our students who intend to do professional work in the church would be able to continue with but little interference. Whether the contacts the students will be subjected to during their four months of basic training under the Legion plan will be an asset or a liability is a debatable question. The answer to this question depends to a great extent upon factors which will vary greatly in the case of the individual. It will also depend to a great extent on the type of military instructors who give the basic training, the moral conditions on the post where the training is given, and in the neighboring communities, and the religious opportunities which are offered, together with the arrangements which are made to make use of those opportunities. It will likewise depend to some extent on what the church will do to prepare its students for their period of military training.

The lay youths of the church will also be affected by compulsory military training under any plan which is offered. Many who would otherwise be to a great extent under the influence of a Christian family and congregation will be removed from that influence and placed in an environment in which they must have unusually close contact with unreligious people, and even some who are violently opposed to religion. This experience will come at a time in their lives when many of them will be far from any safe degree of religious maturity, and when they will be especially susceptible to the evil influences of the world and their own sinful flesh, not to mention the devil, who certainly will not miss this opportunity. In a spiritual sense, many young men of our church will be thrown into the ocean of the world, and told to sink or

or swim, at a time when they have not yet learned to swim very well. Some may learn to become strong swimmers; and some will undoubtedly sink unless effective measures are taken by the church to keep them afloat.

According to the army and navy plans, time will be left free for attendance at religious services. Representatives of all the larger church bodies will be members of the chaplains' corps, and will minister to the needs of their various denominations as much and as often as possible. However, there will continue to be all sorts of hindrances and difficulties in providing religious services and making it possible for the individuals to attend them regularly. There will be all kinds of obstacles to the private devotional exercises of the individual. Unless a different plan is followed than the one which obtained during this past war, many of our men will be without the religious ministrations of our church during at least a part of their training period.

If the Legion plan is adopted, however, employing every possible hour, with a minimum of time off, the religious needs of our men may suffer even a greater neglect, although for a shorter period. But even four months might be disastrous to the spiritual health of the youth of our church, if no time were allowed for at least a weekly religious service during that period. If time is allowed for religious services under the Legion plan, it may be hard for our church to supply all the training centers with the necessary spiritual care.

If the program of compulsory military training is instituted in our

country, no matter which plan is adopted, the church will be confronted with certain problems. It will have to decide what religious ministrations, if any, should be provided for the trainees who would normally be taken care of by their own congregations and pastors, but who will then be in the various training centers for whatever periods of training have been decided upon. The church will have to decide whether it will provide religious care for its trainees, or abandon them for periods ranging from four months to one year to the military or civilian educational agency which is to train them. The church will be faced with the necessity of making a careful study of the training program which is finally adopted. It must decide whether or not to furnish the maximum universal religious instruction, care, and improvement possible. It must decide whether or not it will furnish ministers who will either serve in the various camps as chaplains or in nearby communities as service pastors. It must try to find out whether or not there will be opportunities for mission work among the unchurched under the compulsory military training program. It must decide what to do about such opportunities.

Already in June 1945, the opinions on the issue of the postwar draft appeared well crystallized; and there seems to have been little change since that time. At that time, the attitudes of the general public differed widely from those of the leaders of the nation's schools and colleges. American youth was less enthusiastic, but agreed rather with its parents than with its teachers. The public was in a "need to build a world of international unity". But the public wanted "the gun rather loose in the holster" while it was doing the work required in the

CHAPTER FOUR

Arguments For and Against Compulsory Military Training

It is by no means sure that a program of compulsory military training will be in operation in our country in the near future. While there are many who argue for it, there are also many who argue against it. It will be helpful to consider some of these arguments for and against the plans which have been proposed.

When the subject of compulsory military peacetime training was first brought up in the last part of World War II, there was quite a bit of sentiment that the matter should immediately be brought to a vote. There was also an attitude of "wait and see", and "let us not rush into this thing blindly". It seems this last attitude has prevailed up to this time; for as yet no definite action has been taken in regard to peacetime military training. The latest action of Congress has been an extension of the present selective service act. Congress evidently was not ready to vote on the issue of compulsory military training in peacetime. Meanwhile, the argument, although much less violent than it was in the last half of 1945, is still going on.

Already in June 1945, the opinions on the issue of the peacetime draft appeared well crystalized; and there seems to have been little change since that time. At that time, the attitudes of the general public differed widely from those of the leaders of the nation's schools and colleges. American youth was less enthusiastic, but agreed rather with its parents than with its teachers. The public was in a "mood to build a world of international comity". But the public wanted "the gun rather loose in the holster" while it was doing the work required in the

1
building. There was a majority approval of participation in an international political organization. A potential force to make our participation effect^{ive} was also approved by the majority.

According to the Gallup Poll, the question: "After the war is over, do you think every able-bodied young man should be required to serve one year in the Army or Navy?", received the following answers:

In July 1943, Yes (66%), No (27%), No Opinion (7%)
In November 1943, Yes (63%), No (29%), No Opinion (8%)
In September 1944, Yes (63%), No (23%), No Opinion (14%)
In December 1944, Yes (70%), No (25%), No Opinion (5%)
In May 1945, Yes (70%), No (24%), No Opinion (6%)

Almost half said legislation should not be passed until after the war; but an equally large group wanted immediate action. In regard to the question: "Do you think every able-bodied young man 20 years old should be made to serve in the Army or Navy for one year?", the following answers were received:

In December 1938: Yes (37%), No (63%)
In October 1939: Yes (39%), No (61%)
In June 1940: Yes (50%), No (50%)
In July 1940: Yes (67%), No (33%)
In August 1940: Yes (66%), No (34%)

The National Opinion Research Center asked the question: "Would you be in favor, or would you be against a law that would require boys to take a year's military training after the war when they became 18 years old?", and received these answers:

In 1944, 79% were in favor; 17% were against it; and 4% had no opinion
In 1945, 72% were in favor; 20% were against it; and 8% had no opinion

In regard to possible international repercussions of the peacetime draft, in 1944, 7 out of 10 thought that if the United States should have the draft, others would follow suit. But they could foresee no serious consequences. 8 out of 10 felt that even if this did happen, it would not lead to future wars. The poll showed that people who wanted compulsory military training in peacetime were more favorably inclined toward United States participation in a world organization than those who opposed the compulsory training. 8 in 10 of those who favored compulsory military training considered President Roosevelt's pre-Pearl Harbor policies correct; while only 6 in 10 of those who opposed compulsory military training felt that way about our late president's policies.

In July 1944, the following public reaction was reported by a Fortune Survey. When they were asked the question: "After the war, do you think the United States should draft all young men for a certain amount of army training during peacetime?", 69.1% answered yes; 21.1% answered no; 9.8% had no opinion. To the question: "After the war, do you think the United States should draft all young men for a certain amount of training during peacetime, or should we go back to the regular army system of taking volunteers only?", 61.4% were in favor of a draft; 29.4% were in favor of volunteers; and 9.2% had no opinion. 46.9% thought one year was the proper length for the training period. 16.7% thought it should last for two years. The remaining groups voted for periods ranging from six months to two years. 44% thought the trainees should be 18 years old. 30% thought they should be under 18. 17% were of the opinion they should be older than 18. 7% had no opinion. When

the question was asked: "After the war, do you think the United States should have an army large enough for the country's needs by taking volunteers only?", 42.0% answered yes; 42.3% answered no; and 15.7% ventured no opinion. In March 1939, 75% opposed the suggestion that every adult should spend at least two years in the army. In May 1940, 53% voted for compulsory military training for men in the 18 to 20 age group. In September 1942, 69% agreed to the general principle that every man should have some military training even in peacetime.

According to a Gallup Poll in February 1945, 50% of those questioned wanted a peacetime United States army of at least 500,000. According to the Fortune Survey of June 1945, 80% of those questioned thought the United States should have a larger armed force after the war than Britain, Russia, China, or France.

In the fall of 1944, the Institute of Student Opinion asked both male and female high school students: "Are you in favor of one year's compulsory training for 17 to 23 year old boys after the war?" Of the boys questioned, 58.5% answered yes; 30.5% answered no; and 11% had no opinion. Of the girls questioned, 38.5% answered yes; 44.5% answered no; 17.0% had no opinion. So the total for the high school students in this poll was: 48.5% - yes; 37.5% - no; and 14.0% - no opinion. To the question: "Are you in favor of one year's compulsory service not necessarily military for 17 to 23 year old boys after the war?", the boys answered yes (46.5%), no (41.0%), no opinion (12.5%). The girls answered yes (45.5%), no (38.5%), and no opinion (16.0%). A survey conducted among the students of Denver University revealed that 54% approved

one year of compulsory peacetime military training. The majority of the men students opposed the plan. The majority of the woman students approved it. One half of the students were against considering legislation on the matter before the end of the war.

According to a study conducted by the Division of the National Educational Association devoted to research which quizzed the superintendents of school in communities over 2,500, the president or secretary of each unit of the association, and a random sample of high school principals, and received 3,800 out of the 7,700 questionnaires sent out, there was much opposition to the idea of compulsory military training in peacetime among the educators of our country. To the question: "Assuming that a decision is to be made now, and that your opinion will influence Congress, do you favor a full year of compulsory military training for all able-bodied young men, the training to be given in military camps under the exclusive direction of the regular military agencies: Army, Navy, etc.?", the following answers were given. 37% of the superintendents answered yes. 63% answered no. 32% of the principals answered yes. 68% answered no. 40% of the teachers answered yes. 64% answered no. No provision was made for "no opinion" answers. 68% of those who returned the questionnaires were against immediate consideration of the question of peacetime military training. 8 out of 10 were, however, not against all forms of compulsory peacetime military training. 50% favored a combined plan; military training plus something else; but the suggestions for the "something else", when they were specific, varied greatly. Most educators wanted the schools and colleges to have a hand

in the training program.

A poll of experts² (composed of prominent educators) set up by the American Magazine, whose findings were reported in the June 1945 issue,³ reported that 16% considered compulsory military training good; 58% considered it harmful; and 26% were doubtful.

Those who were in favor of the program called attention to the value of being trained if called upon to fight. They mentioned the benefits of physical fitness which would result from the program, the better food, the improved eating habits, the regular exercise, the regularity of sleep, the medical attention provided. They did think, however, that there were better ways to improve health. Some suggested a general health improvement program in the nation beginning at earliest childhood, for all the nation's children. A defect of the military program is that it begins too late and leaves out those who need help the most. The benefits of army discipline were mentioned, also the good effects army training would have upon the citizenship of our youth. Our young people would learn obedience, teamwork, cooperation, tolerance, and a spirit of service to our country. They directed attention to the mental growth and the physical development that would result from the program. Many would learn useful skills. They would get the benefit of broadening courses of instruction. There would be opportunities for wide travel. The association with all sorts of people would be valu-

² The American Magazine, June 1945 - pages 94 and 95

³ The American Magazine, June 1945 - page 34 ff.

able in teaching tolerance and understanding of others. A life of hard work would strengthen their character and improve their mental level. Most of the experts preferred other methods of training, however. They suggested improved and expanded work in the schools, the strengthening of home and church influence, and national and community training under civilian, rather than military, control.

The experts who were against peacetime compulsory military training objected that it would take a valuable year out of life, that it would keep the youth from continuing their education, that it would delay their career, prevent marriage, or at least preparation for marriage, and uproot the young men from their home and their community at an important stage of their growth. They complained about the undemocratic influence of the military way of life, the authoritarian kind of obedience, the narrow discipline which would run counter to individual initiative and the self-discipline of democratic citizenship. They claimed the young men would become accustomed to regimentation, that military views would be indoctrinated in their minds, that they would learn to rely on force to achieve their goals instead of on democratic discussion and voluntary agreement. They feared the growth and development of a military caste which would acquire too much prestige and power. They said the program would have bad effects on character, that it would result in personal problems, that too close contact would result in inability to get along with others, that a poor attitude toward work would be developed, that feelings of resentment and frustration would be encouraged, that mental and emotional problems would increase

under the strain of military life. They thought the youths would resent the seemingly unnecessary interference with their plans and freedom, that they would rebel against the dull routine and apparent futility of military life. They claimed habits of slackness would be encouraged by the numerous regulations and the abundant red tape which characterize military life. They dreaded the effect of the army life on the morals of the young men, removed from their home environment, de-personalized, living under the conditions of barracks life and discipline, exposed to the temptations of sex, drinking, and gambling.

In addition to the poll of educators chosen by the American Magazine, individual educators have expressed themselves for and against compulsory military training in peacetime. Among those who approve of such training is William E.F. Russell, Dean of the Teachers' College, Columbia University. He stated that the program should be adopted because it was the considered recommendation of military leaders whose business it is to plan national defense, and because there would perhaps be no "breathing spell" in which to get ready the next time. He noted that the program could easily be abolished should it prove unnecessary. He cautioned that pressure should be brought upon the army and navy so to administer their training that public support will continue. He suggested that the training consume only the necessary time, that there be no boondoggling. He wanted no organized crime or vice near military installations. He demanded proper provision for health and welfare, an

³ The Rotarian, January 1945 - page 26

⁴ Parents' Magazine, October 1945 - page 20 ff.

adequate educational program, and a new type officer to replace the martinet type so often associated with peacetime military leadership.

5

A group of fourteen educators who favor compulsory military training stated that they were in favor of an adequate national defense program, and, incidental to this program, a plan of compulsory military training which should be thought through while we are conscious of the realities of war, not when we are lulled by a false sense of security. They said they would rather have a democratic plan of military training than a large professional army.

6

Ray. F. Meyers, high school principal of Council Bluffs, Iowa, was in favor of compulsory military training effectuated through R.O.T.C. units in high schools. He wanted physical education with a purpose.

A.G. Keller, emeritus professor of the science of society at Yale university, claimed that military training in the United States is not as narrow and harsh as some say. Answering the objection that West Point breaks spirits, he contended that it builds and strengthens body, mind, and character; and West Point men make good military instructors. He called attention to the terrible object lessons of two world wars, and that both privileged and unprivileged individuals will be better off under the compulsory military training system. He claimed that being "toughened" in mental and moral fibre by military training is not synonymous with being "brutalized", as some argue. He was of the opinion

5 Scholastic Speaker and Debater, October 15, 1945 - page 4 ff.

6 The Rotarian, January 1945 - page 26

7 The Scientific Monthly, August 1945 - pages 85-89

that much modern school education could be spared without shattering loss, four years could be taught in three, a year could be saved anywhere along the line to make up for the year devoted to military training. He contended that military education would supply the lack of discipline and duty education in civilian educational systems, and that the military training would be laboratory training in democracy.

W.C. McGinnis, superintendent of schools, Perth Amboy, New Jersey, answered the question, "Should the schools back military training?", in the affirmative. ⁸ He argued that the United States sows seeds of war in fields of military unpreparedness, that education, though important, could not substitute for preparedness, that compulsory military training is necessary to safeguard the welfare of the nation, that European militarism is no parallel to our training plans, and, the program being not primarily a health and physical education program, all arguments that a health program could be better carried out by other agencies are not valid. ⁹ *... despite of the great costs and hazards, but that he believed*

Mary Earhart, assistant professor of political science at Northwestern University, adds the following arguments in favor of compulsory military training: We need a military force to do our part in keeping the peace. A citizen army, being more democratic, is preferable to a large standing army. Military weakness invites aggression. The system of compulsory military training has been advised by all top-ranking military experts.

⁸ The Journal of Education, January 1946 - pages 10-12

⁹ Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - pages 46-57

Willard Waller, associate professor of sociology at Barnard College, Columbia University, stated that there was little to go on to evaluate the probable effectiveness of social results of universal military training, that there was no American experience, and that it was hard to discover what European experience teaches. He believed the only thing a person could do to reach a conclusion was to weigh and balance against each other a number of uncertain possibilities and probabilities. He made an analysis of these, answering such questions as: What is the prospect of future wars? Will the United States be involved? Will conscription increase or decrease the probability of war? Will it tend to produce war? Will it prevent war? What is the helpfulness of the program as a measure of preparedness? What are the social costs? What are the incidental benefits? What other measures are needed to assure adequate preparedness? Is military preparedness enough for security? The result of his analysis was that he would vote for it in spite of the great costs and hazards, but that he believed the military program would have to be supplemented by broad social programs to be secure, that some form of preparedness was needed, that conscription was the necessary first step, and that the best course would be to adopt the training and attempt to cut the costs and avoid the hazards.

11

Hajo Holborn, professor of history at Yale University, cited the

10 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September 1945 - pages 95-101

11 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September 1945 - page 123

experience of France as a proof that peacetime conscription is not incompatible with democratic institutions. He called attention to the fact that before the third republic, the rulers of France feared to use conscription to the full because of the danger to their social order.

¹²
He stated that the political anemia of republican government in France was caused by reactionary forces, and not by peacetime conscription.

He called attention to the fact that Germany was a militaristic state long before it practiced universal conscription. Hence "conscription ¹³ does not hinder democratic development". He reminded of the trend away

from masses of men in this war, but that the experiences of the war did not confirm the predictions that large masses of men were unnecessary.

¹⁴
Masses of men are still needed. We won the war because we could ¹⁵ hurl them at the enemy. He stated that military needs could not be met by volunteers, no matter what inducements were offered.

The list of educators who opposed compulsory military training is much longer than the list of those who are in favor of it. Many of them repeat the arguments of others. We will try to consider the opposing arguments they have added to those offered by the American Magazine poll of experts.

12 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 124

13 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 125

14 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 127

15 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 128

William P. Tolley, chancellor of Syracuse University, called attention to the scarcity of engineers, chemists, physicists, mathematicians, doctors, and dentists, and claimed a year of their education could not be spared.

Dr. Arthur Holly Compton, dean of the University of Chicago, reminded that the education of scientific students had already been interrupted for a period of several years, and that further interruption would be disastrous.

A poll of 2,120 school superintendents, 1,430 principals, and 250 classroom teachers, made by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Educational Association and the Problems and Plans Committee of the American Council of Education, yielded the following additional arguments against peacetime compulsory military training: It is against the American military tradition. It means a return to the cynicism of the 1920's or an admission that we must continue to live in an armed camp, and that the hopes of a more peaceful world will not be realized. It constitutes a federal invasion of education, and threatens a conflict with state and local autonomy. Military control of the country and totalitarian hazards resulting from doctrines inimical to the American way of life are also possibilities that may be created by the program.

Felix Morley, president of Haverford College, injected these additional arguments.

16 Parents' Magazine, October 1945 - page 21 . 1945 - page 4 17.

17 Parents' Magazine, July 1945 - page 17

18 The Saturday Evening Post, March 24, 1945 - page 17

tional thoughts into the discussion; A universal peacetime military training system is dangerous to the Quakers, the Mennonites, the Brethren, and other more or less pacifist sects. It weakens states' rights and local responsibilities of citizens. It is a dangerous centralization of power in the hands of military leaders.

A group of twelve educators who oppose military training stated that it was in order to continue the program of public education in the requirements of national defense, but people should not be urged to act under the tensions of war psychology. They said compulsory military training would show a distrust of the peace. They did not favor even the control of one year's education by the federal government.

Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council of Education, mentioned two alternatives as an argument against compulsory military training: 1 An international agreement eliminating compulsory military service from the practices and policies of all nations. 2 A plan to "concentrate upon the fundamental issue of world organization to preserve peace and security by strengthening the existing United Nations organization".

By a six to one vote, the Association of American Colleges pronounced the president's plan for peacetime conscription "premature and prejudicial". They claimed it would adversely affect the work of the United Nations organization.

19 Scholastic Speaker and Debater, October 15, 1945 - page 4 ff.

20 The Cresset, February 1946 - page 7

21 The Christian Century, January 23, 1946 - page 99

Tully C. Knoles, president of the College of the Pacific at Stockton, California, stated that to do away with the need of compulsory military training, colleges and universities should maintain R.O.T.C units for officer material, and camps should be established offering a minimum term of three months of military training any time of the year.

Colonel D.C. Pearson, superintendent of the New Mexico Military Institute at Roxwell, New Mexico, added the thought that the compulsory military training plan "flavors too much of Nazi regimentation", that it will keep some from returning to school, that it will not prevent future wars, and that it will add to the taxpayer's burdens.

Thomas H. Hazlehurst, chemistry professor of Lehigh University, argued that if the training is for warfare, it will be outmoded by the time it can be used; if not for warfare, he cannot see how it can contribute directly to national defense. He claimed a firm habit of submission to authority could not be established in one year, making such a short period of army discipline ineffective. He remarked that army "getting together" is vastly overrated as a force promoting understanding and cooperation, and the net result of military training to education would not be one lost year, but many lost years.

Dwight L. Bolinger of the University of Southern California stated that soldiers should be the last resort to bring about peace, that the

22 The Rotarian, January 1945 - page 27

23 The Scientific Monthly, October 1945 - pages 289-292

24 The American Association of University Professors' Bulletin, Spring 1945 - pages 97-102

next catastrophe may not be another world war, so why go "daft on the subject of war", that wars should be fought where they start, before they develop; therefore a large striking force is not really necessary. Having such a striking force is a constant temptation to use it.

25
Dean W. Malott, chancellor of the University of Kansas, wrote that there is little to concern us in the way of military threats for several years. Are we afraid of England, Russia, or ourselves?

26
Wilbur A. Yauch of Ohio University repeated several arguments against compulsory military training which have already been stated; but added the thought that we will show our lack of faith if we come to the conference table armed to the teeth.

27
Halford L. Hoskins, director of the School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C., added the following arguments. The cost of military training is high from every point of view - time, money, and sacrifices in our way of life. Moral strength should be considered as well as military strength. Compulsory military training in peacetime will increase tendencies toward state socialism. The trend toward imperialism may be strengthened. There is danger of becoming involved in the old and treacherous game of power politics, and of starting an armament race in South America.

Rainer Schickele, principal agricultural economist in the United

25 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, School and Society, March 2, 1946 - page 146

26 The Journal of Education, January 1946 - page 14

27 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,

28 September 1945 - pages 58-66

States Department of Agriculture and lecturer in economics at George Washington University, working together with Glenn D. Everett, economic writer on the Washington staff of a national news magazine, worked out a detailed study of the cost of the compulsory military training system. They estimated the total peacetime armament program, as outlined by army and navy, would cost ten billion dollars a year at present prices. They concluded that the huge costs can only be justified if the program can add something to the United States military potential which is not already obtained by its industrial capacity and the proposed regular armed forces.

A.J. Brumbaugh, vice-president of the American Council of Education, added these arguments to the opposition to compulsory military training; Military education and military health services are not adequate for the nation's needs. The broader phases of vocational training are beyond the scope of military training. Good democratic citizenship is not promoted by army citizenship training; and military discipline does not produce discipline for democratic citizenship.

Preparatory school students at Philipps Academy at Andover, Massachusetts, 42% of whom opposed compulsory military training, made these comments in regard to it: It is the wrong way to keep peace. Armies

28 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September 1945 - pages 102-112

29 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September 1945 - pages 114-122

30 *Newsweek*, March 11, 1946 - page 87

are outmoded by scientific progress. Statesmen are needed, not fighters. It shows a lack of faith in the United Nations. The army would have an intellectually and morally-degenerative influence on them. The army is not stimulating. Let volunteers do it. Let "George" (non-college man) do it. "George" at Andover, the only non-college man questioned, said he would not enlist unless he were out of a job.

Church leaders, as a rule, have opposed compulsory military training. Some have done so for pacifist reasons. Others have considered it unwise for a variety of other reasons. One church leader who does not oppose the compulsory military training system is Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, who made the observation several years ago that it is better to have a strong military force and not need it, than to need it and not have it. ³⁰ presented on March 7, 1946, suggested that the United States

Among the churchmen who oppose compulsory military training is the ³¹ noted Lutheran Hour speaker, Dr. Walter A. Maier. He called the proposal un-American, claiming our country is one of the few nations which has from the beginning opposed conscripted peacetime military service. He stated the proposal has no positive promise of success, that it is over-expensive, that it would tend to promote profiteering and dishonesty, that it would be demoralizing to the trainees, that it would promote the madness of militarism in our country, that it would tend to involve us in international situations, that it will fail to give the economic relief some claim for it, and that it can easily lead to an unnecessary, unhealthy, un-Christian government control of the conscience.

31 The Walther League Messenger, March 1945 - page 236 ff.

Harold Case, clergyman of Scranton, Pennsylvania, could see no sound reason for compulsory military training when he was asked to express his opinion some months ago. He thought it ran counter to the things America stands for, would not prevent war, and would have to be repeated in case of war, and that its cost was too great morally and financially.

The Federation of Churches of Rochester and Vicinity, after their attention was directed to the seeming lack of realization of the part of national leaders of the tremendous change that has taken place since the atom bomb was exploded, resolved to oppose peacetime military conscription. A month previously a similar resolution had been tabled.

The section of World Order of the Federal Council of Churches, in a report presented on March 7, 1946, suggested that the United States representatives in the UNO should immediately seek agreement for the universal abolition of peacetime conscription.

Dr. E. Fay Campbell, president of the Council of Church Boards of Education, declared several weeks ago that those who see the drift toward secularism in our society should oppose conscription. He deplored putting our 18-year-olds into the hands of unimaginative officers who think the only way to take care of a boy's sex life is to have enforced prophylaxis treatment for everybody returning from a furlough.

32 The Rotarian, January 1945 - page 27

33 Religious News Service, March 18, 1946

34 The Living Church, March 24, 1945 - page 20

35 The Lutheran Outlook, February 1946 - page 60

Dr. Gould Wickey, executive secretary of the National Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges, op-
36
posed compulsory military training as essentially a method of preparing for war, as a program pregnant with fear, suspicion, and hatred, and one we would not want other nations to follow.

37
According to the last available report, the stand of the senators in regard to compulsory military training was: 25 for the program, 19 against it, 40 undecided. Washington dispatches of the first of April, 1946 asserted the House Military Affairs Committee had decided to post-
38
pone all action on military training until the next Congress. One congressman who is against peacetime compulsory military training is Senator Taft. His stand is representative of the opponents of the training in Congress. He said the program would mean the surrender of individual freedom and the acceptance of dictation. He reminded us we had gone to war to abolish a similar military set-up in Germany and Japan. He did not want the youth of the land subjected to government domination during their most formative year. To him, military conscrip-
39
tion was essentially totalitarian.

The military men of our nation are overwhelmingly in favor of com-
pulsory military training, although even a few of them are opposed to it. Practically all the high-ranking military leaders support the training.

36 The Lutheran Outlook, January 1946 - page 32

37 Time, November 5, 1945 - page 63

38 The Christian Century, April 3, 1946 - page 421 Social Science,

September 1945 - pages 12-15

39 Vital Speeches of the Day, July 1, 1945 - pages 554-557

40

General Marshall stated that as long as we need weapons, we need men to handle them, that universal military training is needed to provide the men. He claimed the atomic bomb and economic power were incomplete substitutes for more visible forms of power. General Eisenhower stated that fairness to the country and the individual chances of survival in war demand intelligent training of the kind supplied by a compulsory military training program. Major George Fielding Eliot looked upon the program as essential to our responsibilities as a member of the United Nations, and as a national insurance policy if that organization fails. He feared an unready America would find its international influence soon waning, its policies disregarded, and its proposals ignored.

43

Admiral William A. Pratt argued that war has twice shown us the folly of unpreparedness. He branded the wait-and-see trend of thought as dangerous and fallacious. He deplored the necessity of gaining time at the expense of bloodshed. He said military strength depends on the number of trained men who can be organized into an efficient force, hence the need of a compulsory military training program. Vice-admiral Randall Jacobs, chief of naval personnel, wrote that trained citizens are needed in addition to alert scientific research. He warned that the political

44

40 Newsweek, October 22, 1945 - page 43

41 Time, November 5, 1945 - page 21

42 McCall's Magazine, July 1945 - page 19

43 Newsweek, November 26, 1945 - page 63

44 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - pages 72-76

45 ... July 3, 1945 - page 500

and economic chaos in Europe may give rise to new dangers. New giant states may be developing. We inspire hatred as well as friendship; so we should strive to inspire respect rather than popularity. Our own will is for peace, law, and order; yet 60% of our people expect another world war within fifty years. We should prepare now. Each year of delay means the loss of 850,000 trained men. There is also the yearly decrease of veterans of this war. Only compulsory military training can keep our reservoir full. He was of the opinion that peace-loving nations would not complain if we take sensible precautions.

45

Ralph A. Bard, under-secretary of the navy, said the universal military training is necessary for an adequate program of national defense. He claimed it will enable us to speak with greater authority in favor of an international organization to enforce peace, and reassure other peace-loving nations that the United States will cooperate with them in outlawing war. He thought it more democratic and fitting to insure national security by universal military training than by a large standing army. He warned that an inadequate armed force would result in an appeasement policy before war, and a costly defensive strategy during the first phases of a war. He called attention to some valuable by-products of the training: improvement of physical health, lessening of illiteracy, development of responsible citizenship and sound character, strengthening of home discipline and self-control, slight interference, if any, with the education of the 20% who go to college, and stimulation of the thinking of the 80% who do not go to college.

Secretary of War James Forrestal said that a poll of the servicemen would preponderantly favor universal service because "they believe as I do that the means to make war should be in the possession of the nations which hate war." Admirals King, Nimitz, and Halsey agreed with this statement. Former Secretary of War Stimson said that universal training did not have its birth in militarism or autoeracy. It has almost everywhere followed the banner of freedom and democracy.

Among the opponents of compulsory military training is General Herbert C. Holdridge, chairman of the Veterans League of America. He was formerly a West Pointer, and has now retired from active duty. He said that compulsory military training and large mass armies are as dangerous as the Maginot Line complex.

Richard Harrison, a retired naval officer, advocated a program of compulsory military training for both girls and boys. He claimed it would have a maturing effect similar to the hardships of frontier days.

E. J. Kahn, Jr., a warrant officer who was a former pacifist, learned from his war experience that it is worth a pound of prevention to prevent an ounce of war. He claimed selfishness is one of the principal stumbling blocks in the way of a national acceptance of compulsory military training. He advocated it as a "margin of safety".

A veteran who opposes compulsory Military training gave pen to this

46 Time, November 5, 1945 - page 21

47 The Christian Century, April 17, 1946

48 The Rotarian, January 1945 - page 28

49 The Saturday Evening Post, May 19, 1945 - page 27

50

quotation; "We had a right to expect that in return for our services on the global front, the home front would give peace a fair trial If it takes two to make a war, we are certain that we are one of them."

Business men of the nation have also joined in the argument about compulsory military training. The attitudes of some of the proponents, as sampled by the Rotarian magazine: E. W. Palmer, book manufacturer of Kingsport, Tennessee, said the objections to the plans were more than offset by the physical-training, national security, disciplinary, and educational values. J. Eugene Conklin, insurance underwriter of Hutchinson, Kansas, felt the training should be adopted for health reasons. R. Donald Yauch, building material distributor of Uniontown, Pennsylvania, stated that his military training had been the outstanding experience of his life, and favor^d it for all young men after high school. Daniel F. Lincoln, funeral director of Jamestown, New York, believed on the basis of his navy experience that military training widens the very foundations of democracy through the associations which are formed with men of every kind. Samuel L. Shanaman, lumber retailer of Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, bemoaned the folly of unpreparedness, and thought the period between high school and college would be ideal for the training. Charles N. Cadwallader, furs manufacturer of Lincoln, Nebraska, was appalled at the health standards of our nation, and favored the program for health reasons. He also mentioned the benefits of discipline under men of exemplary character and high standards of great worth.

50 The Atlantic Monthly, February 1946 - page 54

51 The Rotarian, January 1945 - pages 26-28

Harry Hall, newspaper publisher of Dothan, Alabama, favored the year between high school and college for military training, not as a vacation, but as a period of intensive training and discipline of a high order to make us more conscious of our responsibilities as citizens in a democracy.

Samples of the attitudes of opponents to compulsory military training: W.G. Edson, lawyer of Storm Lake, Iowa, claimed the system brought Germany conquest and defeat. He called attention to the fact that she was beaten by nations without large standing armies. Ralph E. Shannon, newspaper editor of Washington, Iowa, claimed training in military barracks of the rudiments of war was not good for the country. Howell G. Evans, furniture manufacturer of Two Rivers, Wisconsin, expressed the opinion that national security comes not from a show of fighting strength, but from the strengthening of the spirit of a people and the will to hold to what they consider dear and precious. Harold E. Howe, YMCA directive secretary of Lowell, Massachusetts, considered the program undemocratic and feared it would inspire military thinking. He was of the opinion that better discipline than military discipline could be provided.

A few additional arguments for and against the various plans are worthy of our consideration. We will consider first some that favor the plan; and some that oppose compulsory military training will be presented later to conclude this section.

52

Raymond Moley's argument is that the proposed year of training would not seriously interrupt civilian careers, and would furnish a pause which would simplify and improve college education, since most freshmen were

too immature as it was. He thought the boys had better be prepared because they would probably be exposed to the dangers of warfare anyway.

53

Bernard De Voto was sure two of our great wars, and probably all our small wars (except Indian wars) could have been prevented, or at least made shorter and less costly, if we had been prepared. He feared a resumption of the policy of military weakness would cause us to suffer swift and total defeat in the next war. He suggested we establish the best system of preparedness now and improve it as we go on. He looked upon military discipline as an experience which encourages self-knowledge and mastery.

54

Delmar L. Dyreson observed that replacement in Africa and Italy was by men who were neither physically nor psychologically trained for mortal combat. Though not unmindful of the many ills of universal military training, he foresaw even greater ills if the nation were crushed by a military disaster. As a reserve chaplain before Pearl Harbor, he knew about the struggle to survive. He would not want his son to be in the same circumstances. To his mind, the atomic bomb does not take away the necessity of training. He reasoned that to be democratic, training must be universal; to be universal, it must be compulsory. He claimed the lack of a competent military force would constitute self-betrayal.

Henry Steele Commager, speaking against compulsory military training, criticized the military leaders for advancing their plan in a vacuum. In studying General Marshall's report, he noticed that on the same page

55

53 Harpers Magazine, April 1945 - page 410

54 The Christian Century, January 2, 1946 - pages 9 and 10

55 The Christian Century, August 29, 1945 - page 573

55 The Atlantic Monthly, February 1946 - page 54

in which he suggests the next war will be an atomic war, over in a few days, he urges conscription so we can count on an army of four million in a year. He warned we should not adopt a conscription program so expensive that it will imperil appropriations for other essentials of security. We should study the whole matter of national security.

56

Hanson W. Baldwin averred conscription has never stopped war nor made it less frequent. He observed that "modern wars do not sneak up on anybody". He saw no immediate need of a compulsory military training program in any case since we still have a reserve of veterans.

57

The Christian Century Magazine made the point that, at the military committee hearings, conscription was supported by generals, admirals, "professional patrioteers and the voice of big business" and opposed by representatives of organizations interested in the maintenance of human rights and the building of human character. The magazine quoted Hitler: "We stand for compulsory military service for every man. If a state is not worth that, then away with it. Then you must not complain if you are enslaved ... No one gives you freedom save only by your sword!"

58

After the atomic bombs fell, this magazine proclaimed that the atomic bomb had demolished the arguments for a large army and a program of universal military training, and that the picture of war had changed.

Among his ten reasons to reject universal military service, Frank

59

L. Wright added these arguments to those already mentioned: Compulsory

56 Harpers Magazine, April 1945 - page 410 strength lies also in our

57 The Christian Century, June 27, 1945 - page 749 - 187

58 The Christian Century, August 29, 1945 - page 973

59 The Christian Century, March 7, 1945 - page 299 11 and 12

military training has never been known to develop moral or spiritual life. It would grant the government (through prejudiced and super-patriotic officers) arbitrary control of individual thought and conscience. It would aggravate racial discrimination. It could not guarantee national security. It would cause both allies and neutrals to lose confidence in the United States.

60

A.E. Morgan distrusted the West Point and Annapolis philosophy, and did not want all America indoctrinated with it. He claimed the authoritarian and dictatorial temper of West Point ruled the army, that it was not just a regime for training military men, but a cult which would bring about a medieval coercive indoctrination of young minds. He objected to the character traits developed at West Point and did not want to have all America impregnated with them. He claimed the extension of West Point influence in the training program would menace our long-time military security, that it would foster regimentation and arbitrary subordination to authority which would be deadly to alert creative inquiry. He called attention to the army's reactionary policies and its resistance to change and improvement which he claims are an evidence of the West Point influence. He argued that the obedience of military discipline is not the kind that lasts, but often leads to greater disobedience when the pressure is removed.

61

Alexander John Alexander called conscription the poorest expression of national strength, avowing that national strength lies also in our

60 The American Mercury, February 1946 - pages 159-167

61 The Christian Century, January 2, 1946 - pages 11 and 12

productive economy, and a vigorous moral sense and devotion to worthy ideals. He asserted compulsory military training would weaken these.

He declared it would breed stagnation in training and resistance to change.

Norman Thomas, five-time defeated socialist candidate for president of the United States, protested that compulsory military training will increase the suspicion and fear of Russia, and will be a signal for an armament race, thus making war more likely.

Such are the main arguments for and against the compulsory military training plans. No one knows what the final decision in this matter will be. It may be that no action will be taken until next year.

There is no doubt, however, that the coming months will hear some more debate on compulsory military training, and that the new Congress will

be forced to take some action. Unless the present attitude changes

greatly, there will be a program of compulsory military training instituted some time next year, perhaps according to the Legion plan, or a somewhat similar plan.

62 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945 - page 67

... us "that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose". So, whatever happens, the church should not give way to despair. But the church should be watchful. It should be able to make the best of every situation which develops in this world. If a plan of compulsory military training is

CHAPTER FIVE

Steps the Church Should Take

What steps should the church take in regard to compulsory military training under the present unsettled conditions? If no compulsory military training law of any kind is passed, the church will, of course, have no steps to take in regard to this matter. If, and when, a law of some kind is passed, the church should be ready to take the proper steps. The probabilities are, that if a law is passed, the compulsory features will be modified by opportunities for a choice of several alternatives after a short basic course of training. The military features will perhaps be modified by combining them with some civilian training, and by putting the program under civilian control.

The church should watch the trends. It should listen to the arguments presented by both sides, but should not become too excited about them. People who argue are prone to exaggerate. They like to brighten their side, and to darken the other side as much as possible. We must realize that neither the adoption nor the rejection of compulsory military training will mean disaster for the church. We have God's promise¹ that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. God has also promised us "that all things work together for good to them that love God,² to them who are the called according to His purpose". So, whatever happens, the church should not give way to despair. But the church should be watchful. It should be able to make the best of every situation which develops in this world. If a plan of compulsory military training is a-

¹ Matthew 16,18

² Romans 8,28

deoted, it should be ready to take steps to care for its members who are affected by the plan, and to make use of any missionary opportunities created by the operation of the plan.

To leave the watching and the planning to the church as a whole would be a mistake. It would be a case of "let George do it", with no "George" to do it. There should be a group or committee which is charged with the duty of watching developments, and planning and making recommendations to the church. It is not necessary to elect or appoint such a committee. We already have a group of men who have the experience and the proven ability to take care of this matter for the church, the Army and Navy Commission of our church which has done such good work during the war. This commission is still active in caring for those of our members who are still in the armed forces, and those who are receiving treatment in the military hospitals. This commission should be retained and charged with the duty of watching the situation and making the proper plans and proposals if something develops.

If the army and navy plan of compulsory military training is adopted, it will be necessary for our church to have and to keep chaplains in the armed forces. These chaplains should be distributed in the army posts, naval bases, and air bases where the training will be done. They should take care of the spiritual needs of our members and also do all the mission work possible among the unchurched. If the Legion plan, or a similar plan, is adopted, there will probably be more training centers so the youths can train nearer their homes. That will necessitate more chaplains, or an arrangement whereby nearby pastors can serve our members

in the camps. If students for the ministry and for the teaching profession in our church are not exempted, special arrangements should be made to take care of them. They should be assigned to the chaplain's branch for training, and should be trained by the chaplains of our own church. The commission should try its best to make such arrangements; for they are very important.

Not only should care be provided for the youths while they are in training, they should also receive the proper preparation before they enter training. This preparation should be given by the individual local pastors. The youths should be warned of the dangers of military life. Their instructors, unless their quality will be greatly improved under the compulsory training plan, will often be un-Christian, or even anti-Christian. They will use language which violates the commandments of God. They will lead immoral lives. They will at times teach things that do not agree with the teachings of the Bible, as, for example, that it is necessary to hate in order to fight, or that certain amounts of hard drinking and illegitimate sex life are desirable. A certain Brigadier General Henry J. Reilly has been quoted as saying, "Morale is more important than morals to the soldiers. Leave the morale to the army, and to hell with morals. Some people want to keep the young soldier from women and liquor. That's what he needs." He is not the only one who has expressed himself in that way; and many have embroidered their remarks with a mouthful of profanity. The youth of our church should be taught they can expect to meet such men; and therefore they should

be prepared to resist their influence with the word of God and prayer.

Men of our church should be urged by their local pastors to look up a chaplain of our church or the nearest pastor of our church as soon as they possibly can after reaching a training camp. The local pastor should be supplied with the necessary information (if that is at all possible); and he should impart it to his members before they leave for the training camp. The youth of our church should also be instructed that they should only attend communion services conducted by ministers or chaplains of our church. They should be encouraged to keep up their Bible reading and study, their praying, and the practice of their Christianity in their every-day lives. They should be taught to look upon their period of training not only as an opportunity to obtain military knowledge and skill, but also as a missionary opportunity, as an opportunity to do some spiritual work among their fellow-trainees, as an opportunity, with the help of the Lord their God, to gather some lively stones to be used in the building of God's temple.

There will be many temptations confronting the young men of our church in the compulsory military training system. They will be tempted ^{by} their own flesh when they will be removed from the restraints of their home and their local church. The world will tempt them to vices and crimes in communities which are strange to them. The devil himself will not be idle. We can rest assured that he will make efficient use also of the opportunities provided him in the compulsory military training system.

We cannot hope that all our youth will return from their period of

training strengthened spiritually and morally. It is inevitable that some will return to civilian life weakened morally and spiritually; and it may be that their moral and spiritual weakness may be greater than it would be if they had not taken part in compulsory military training. We will not be able to put all the blame for this upon the military training program, however. Some of the blame may have to be put upon the church for not preparing these youths properly. Some of the blame may have to be put upon the young men themselves because they did not put their faith into practice. I believe that the youth of our church who are properly prepared for their period of training by their home pastors, who make use of the advice given them, who make early contact with the pastors and chaplains of our church near and in their training camps, and maintain that contact throughout their training period, and who actually live their faith, will not be hurt by their period of compulsory military training. They will be an influence for good to their fellow-trainees. They will resist the temptations which come to them with the word of God and prayer. They will return to civilian life stronger both morally and spiritually. Their faith will be tried and purified. They will be better, more experienced, and more intelligent members of our church who will be more anxious to take an active part in the work of our congregations.

Military discipline, if it is correctly applied by the right type of officers, will be a definite aid in building the character of the youth of our church. If we have laid the right foundation in the hearts of our youth, the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ

Himself being the chief cornerstone, military discipline will be able to build up character upon that foundation. Military discipline has been defined as follows: "Military discipline is that mental attitude and state of training which renders obedience and proper conduct instinctive under all conditions. It is founded upon respect for, and loyalty to, properly constituted authority. While it is developed primarily by military drill, every feature of military life has its effect on military discipline." Such military discipline develops order. It promotes cooperation. It calls for obedience to authority. It encourages precision. It teaches accuracy. It indoctrinates the principle of sharing with others. It fosters consideration of others. It insists on honesty. It promotes trust among the men. It nourishes loyalty. It inculcates truth. It rewards faithfulness. It develops initiative. It is an important factor in improving leadership. It is based on justice. It instills promptness. It calls for self-control. It insists on cleanliness. It requires neatness. It implants respect. It is concerned about efficiency. It encourages cheerfulness. It teaches courtesy. These certainly are valuable character traits -- valuable to the individual, and also to the church. If any or all of them are built up in our youth during their period of training, the church owes a vote of thanks to the compulsory military training program. If the armed forces fail to build them up in our youth, the church should do its best to do what the armed forces have failed to do. For the church has resources at hand which no military organization can have -- the law

of God, which, unlike army regulations, is always right and never wrong, and the gospel of Jesus Christ which alone can supply the motive power necessary to build Christian character.

So let the church make every effort to get all the good it can out of the compulsory military training program, when and if it is adopted by our country; and let it make every effort to combat the evils of the program. We have the weapons to fight against those evils.

They are the same weapons we use to fight against any of the evils of this world: the girdle of God's truth, the breastplate of His righteousness, the sandals of the preparation of the gospel of peace, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God. Let us take unto ourselves this whole armor of God. Let us put it on. Let us use it to withstand in every evil day. Then our church will be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might; and no matter what happens in this world of ours, our church's share of the work of God's kingdom will go on with all possible efficiency and success.

5 Ephesians 6, 14-15 6 Ephesians 6, 10

Francis J. Brown - The Issue Should Be Decided Later. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 77-85

A. J. Drumbaugh - Education - By What, For What? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 122-123

Henry Steele Commager - Where are We Headed? The Atlantic Monthly, February 1946, p. 54-59

Josephus Daniels - Former Navy Secretary Opposes Training. Scholastic Speaker and Debater, October 18, 1945, p. 3 ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

The Holy Bible - King James Version

Theodore Graebner - War in the Light of Prophecy. St. Louis, Mo., 1941

Edward W.A. Koehler - A Summary of Christian Doctrine, River Forest, Ill., 1939

B. Booklets

Louis J. Roehm - The Christian's Attitude Toward His Government and on War

The American Legion - the American Legion presents Common Sense Security

United States War Department - Universal Military Training

C. Periodicals

Alexander John Alexander - Peacetime Conscription. The Christian Century, January 2, 1946, p. 11A12

Paul Russell Anderson - National Security in the Postwar World. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 1-7

Ralph A. Bard - Universal Military Training; What the Navy Contemplates. Vital Speeches of the Day, July 1, 1945, p. 559-561

Dwight L. Bolinger - Universal Military Training. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, Spring 1945, p. 97-102

Albert R. Brinkman - Compulsory Military Education in the Post-war Educational Program. Education, October 1945, p. 67-72

Francis J. Brown - The Issue Should Be Decided Later. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 77-85

A.J. Brumbaugh - Education - By Whom, For What? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 113-122

Henry Steele Commager - Where are We Headed? The Atlantic Monthly, February 1946, p. 54-59

Josephus Daniels - Former Navy Secretary Opposes Training. Scholastic Speaker and Debater, October 15, 1945, p. 5 ff.

- Bernard De Voto - Easy Chair: Universal Military Training in Peacetime. Harper's Magazine, April 1945, p. 410-413
- Delmar L. Dyreson - Peacetime Conscription. The Christian Century, January 2, 1946, p. 9-12
- Mary Earhart - The Value of Universal Military Training in Maintaining Peace. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 46-57
- George Fielding Eliot - A Year of Your Boy's Life. McCall's Magazine, July 1945, p. 19 ff.
- Benjamin W. Frazier - Military Training, Some Pro's and Con's. School Life, February 18, 1946, p. 15 ff.
- Robert A. Graham - Universal Military Training in Modern History. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 8-14
- John N. Hazard - National Security and the Soviet Union. Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 150-159
- T.H. Hazlehurst - Logic of the Lost Year. The Scientific Monthly, October 1945, p. 289-292
- Lewis B. Hershey - Procurement of Manpower in American Wars. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 15-25
- Hajo Holborn - The Professional Army Versus Military Training. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 123-130
- Halford L. Hoskins - Universal Military Training and American Foreign Policy. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 58-66
- Robert H. Hutchins - Shall we have compulsory military training? No. Senior Scholastic, October 15, 1945, p. 15 ff.
- Randall Jacobs - The Issue Should Be Decided Now. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 72-76
- E.L. Jones - One War is Enough. The Atlantic Monthly, February 1946, p. 48-53
- E.J. Kahn, Jr. - Soldiers' Slant on Compulsory Training. The Saturday Evening Post, May 19, 1945, p. 27

- A.G. Keller - The Fallacy of the Lost Year. The Scientific Monthly, August 1945, p. 85-89
- Omar B. Ketchum - Military Training Thro ugh The National Guard. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 138-143
- Arthur Kornhauser - Will Compulsory Military Training be Good or Bad for our Boys? The American Magazine, June 1945, p.34 ff.
- Ernest K. Lindley - General Marshall and the Interim Army. Newsweek, October 22, 1945, p. 43
- Walter A. Maier - No Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime. The Walther League Messenger, March 1945, p. 236 ff.
- Deane W. Malott - Universal Military Training. School and Society, March 2, 1946, p. 145-147
- John C. McGloy - The Plan of the Armed Services for Universal Military Training. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 26-34
- W.C. McGinnis - Should the Schools Back Military Training? Yes. The Journal of Education, January 1946, p. 10-12
- Andre Mesnard- National Security and France. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 160-166
- Raymond Moley - The Truman Training Plan. Newsweek, November 5, 1945, p. 120
- Arthur E. Morgan - Conscription and the West Point Mind. The American Mercury, February 1946, p. 159-168
- Felix Morley - The Real Case Against Conscription. The Saturday Evening Post, March 24, 1945, p. 17 ff
- Robert P. Patterson - Four Planks for Peacetime Universal Training. Collier's Magazine, November 24, 1945, p. 59
- Now or Never! Woman's Home Companion, August 1945, p. 17 ff
- A.P. - Shall we have compulsory military training? Yes. Senior Scholastic, October 15, 1945, p. 14 ff.
- William V. Pratt - Preparedness as a Weapon for Peace. Newsweek, November 26, 1945, p. 63
- William F. Russell - Should We have Compulsory Military Training? Yes.

- Parents' Magazine, October 1945, p. 20 ff.
- Rainer Schickele and Glen D. Everett - The Economic Implications of Universal Military Training. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 102-112
- Walter W. Sikes - It is Time to Say No. The Christian Century, May 23, 1945, p. 626-628
- Robert A. Taft - Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime; Against Fundamental Policy of America. Vital Speeches of the Day, July 1, 1945, p. 554-557
- Norman Thomas - Arming Against Russia. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 67-71
- William P. Tolley - Should We Have Compulsory Military Training? No. Parents' Magazine, October 1945, p. 21 ff.
- Oswald Garrison Villard - Universal Military Training and Military Preparedness. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 35-45
- Willard Waller - A Sociologist Looks at Conscription. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 95-101
- Ernest H. Wilkins - Wanted: An Over-All Plan of National Defense. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 131-137
- Frank L. Wright - Ten Reasons to Reject Universal Military Service. The Christian Century, March 7, 1945, p. 299 ff.
- Wilbur A. Yauch - Should the Schools Back Military Training? No. The Journal of Education, January 1946, p. 12-14
- Hedvig Ylvisaker - Public Opinion Toward Compulsory Military Training. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 86-94
- A.P. Young - National Security and Great Britain. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 144-149
- Another Fellow Who Was for Conscription: Hitler. The Christian Century, June 27, 1945, p. 749
- Apathy Menaces the Service Bills as Nation Shifts Interest to Peace.

- Newsweek, February 25, 1946, p. 33**
- Assail Conscription at Education Meet.** The Lutheran Outlook, February 1946, p. 60
- Catholic Veterans Urge Truman to Support Postponement of Conscription Action.** Religious News Service, March 1, 1946
- Atomic Bomb Vs. Military Training.** Scholastic Speaker and Debater, October 15, 1945, p. 1
- College Presidents Take Sides.** Scholastic Speaker and Debater, October 15, 1945, p. 4 ff.
- Compulsory Military Training Symposium.** Rotarian, January 1945, p. 26-28
- Conscription.** The Lutheran, March 6, 1946
- Conscription Foes Show Strength.** The Christian Century, April 17, 1946
- Conscription Hearings.** The Christian Century, June 20, 1945, p. 726
- Conscription's Chances.** Time, November 5, 1945, pages 21&22
- Draft Law Opposed by Church Colleges.** The Lutheran Outlook, January 1946, p. 32
- Eisenhower and Conscription.** The Christian Century, July 25, 1945, p. 854&855
- Educators Oppose Conscription.** The Christian Century, January 23, 1946, p. 99
- General Deplores Mass Conscription.** The Christian Century, April 17, 1946
- Indefinite Draft Demanded.** The Christian Century, April 3, 1946, p. 421
- Mighty Atom Blasts Military Training.** The Christian Century, August 29, 1945, p. 973
- Military Training Issue.** Senior Scholastic, November 12, 1945, p. 9
- Rochester Church Federation Opposes Conscription.** Religious News Service, March 18, 1946
- Study of Lessons to be Learned from the Military Training Program.** Elementary School Journal, October 1945, p. 60-62

- The Case Against Compulsory Military Service. Parents' Magazine, July 1945, p. 17 ff.
- The Church and World Order. The Living Church, March 24, 1946, p. 19-21
- The Gurney-May Bill. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1945, p. 167 ff.
- The Other Fellow's Army. Newsweek, March 11, 1946, p. 87
- To Train or Not to Train. Time, June 18, 1945, p. 13&14
- United States Debates an Ancient Issue in Peacetime Military Service. Newsweek, June 11, 1945, p. 114 ff.
- Universal Training. The Cresset, February 1946, p. 7
- Which Way to End War? The Christian Century, April 17, 1946, p. 487-489
- Will They Also Serve? Newsweek, November 5, 1945, p. 36