FRIEAD, MARCH 13, 1955

A MILITARY REVIEW

When the Institute, a long time ago, received some land from the United States under the provisions of the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, it became one of a group of "land-grant" colleges—and with them instituted the Military Science courses as part of the curriculum. In all of these schools, save those which have a two-year course in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is required. Freshmen at the Institute, therefore, soon learn that basic R.O.T.C. training is a compulsory part of their education and, like death and taxes, is inevitable if they expect to receive a degree.

Diverse opinions have been offered concerning the wisdom of a civilian military training program and the adequacy of organized higher education as a device for officer training. An almost ninety-year old question, however, remains unanswered: Why do we have establishments which laboriously train cadets, an impression of its permanence. Without attempting, therefore, to weigh the pros and cons of these particular arguments we look to another place in the picture where there is a consensus of opinion on the part of observers.

College administrators and students alike have criticized the R.O.T.C. program as it is conducted today as not being typical of college or military standards. Its intellectual weaknesses and inadequacies are recognized primarily in the college of high scholastic standards where R.O.T.C. courses are below college caliber and instruction there is a two-year course in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is required. Freshmen at the Institute, therefore, soon learn that basic R.O.T.C. training is a compulsory part of their education and, like death and taxes, is inevitable if they expect to receive a degree.
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