



The Cadet System in Our Schools

By CAPTAIN O. J. WHEATLEY

THERE are Canadians who object to the introduction of cadet drill into the schools because they think it develops a spirit of militarism.

Experience has proved that this view is incorrect. Boys thoroughly enjoy cadet work without any direct consciousness of its relationship to war.

The boy thinks only of the immediate effort, the immediate discipline and the immediate enjoyment, and not of any ultimate and distant possibility.

This well-known psychological principle has a most important bearing on the whole question of the desirability of introducing cadet work into the schools.

It should be remembered in this connection that soldiers do not cause war. Grave dissensions between nations result from differences between the political and financial leaders of different countries, not from anything the soldiers of the rival coutries say or do. The soldier is not the war-monger. He is more likely to become the war victim.

There are men who attack those who advocate cadet work in the schools, and who charge them with the approving of "conscription." This charge has absolutely no foundation.

The cadet system is a rational substitute for conscription.

It avoids all the evils of conscription, and it develops the best elements of human power and character, while at the same time it secures all the supposed advantages of conscription in the most natural and the most thoroughly effective way.

Those who attack the principle of universal training are evidently not aware of the fact that the law of Canada now recognizes the principle that all men, with comparatively few exceptions, are responsible for the defence of their country. Between the ages of 18 and 45, inclusive, men are now, by law, liable to be called upon when necessary to do military service in the defence of their country.

There is no logical basis for good citizenship but the one that recognizes a man's duties to his country.

There is no proper system of training in citizenship that does not make all children—girls as well as boys—conscious of their responsibilities as individual units in their country.

Boys should understand that they will become responsible for the defeace of their homes and their country when they reach the age of 18. They should be trained to use their influence to avoid war; but the fundamental principle is that they are liable by law to give their services to defend their country when necessary in return for the privileges they enjoy as citizens.

It is an indefensible moral ideal that a man should enjoy the many rights of thizenship without recognizing his responsibility for the dakies of citizenship.

The advocates o a cadet system do not wish any change in the law which makes every man between the ages of 18 and 45 years responsible for the defence of his country. They do, however, regard it as a grievous mistake to make all men within these age limits liable for military service, as 'the law now does, without providing in some way for their training, in order that they may be able to render efficien't service without the terrible sacrifice of life that would naturally result from the vain attempts of masses of untrained men to perform the duty required of them. Universal liability for defence service is unquestionably right. This being true, it clearly follows that all men should, in some way, be prepared to per-form the duty laid upon them by their country.

The country that demands universal service without providing some adequate system of universal training for the men on whom it properly lays the duty is culpaply negligent. The question to be solved really is: What is the most effective and most economical system for giving universal training?



"Hi! Bill! Don't come down this ladder. Pve took it away."