SEMPER EDUCARE: THE HISTORY OF MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION, 1739 - 1992

by

Wiley Newman Boland, Jr.

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Adult and Continuing Education

APPROVED:

Dr. R. McKeen,
Co-Chairman

Dr. H. Stubblefield,
Co-Chairman

Dr. T. Hunt

Dr. A. Wiswell

Dr. L. French

April, 1993

Blacksburg, Virginia

SEMPER EDUCARE: THE HISTORY OF MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION, 1739 - 1992

by

WILEY NEWMAN BOLAND, JR.

Committee Co-Chairmen: Harold W. Stubblefield and Ron McKeen
Adult and Continuing Education

(ABSTRACT)

This study's purpose is to provide a description and chronology of the development of general education during the Marine Corps' history. A review of the various general education activities, with particular emphasis on the establishment of the Vocational Schools Detachment and the Marine Corps Institute accomplished this purpose. The review encompassed 1739 to 1992.

The problem investigated in this study posed particular questions about the establishment of general education activities. Several research questions guided the investigation through specific periods of Marine Corps history. These questions concerned the establishment of general education activities affected by (1) general education initiatives, (2) Marine Corps leaders and other individuals and their contributions, (3) relationships of the changing size and mission, (4) conditions surrounding their creation, (5) educational styles established,

(6) purposes for each, and (7) support measures required by each general education activity.

The historical research method provided the means to reconstruct the past systematically and objectively by collecting, evaluating, verifying, and synthesizing evidence to establish facts and reach defensible conclusions. The researcher collected, categorized, analyzed, integrated, and synthesized data from a mass of sources and interpreted this evidence in context with the sources.

The study found that Marine Corps general education activity development resulted in unique circumstances from a variety of influential change agents throughout five major periods. However, the most influential factor was the occasional leader who interpreted the significance of need and provided leadership to establish or modify a general education activity to meet the need. General John A. Lejeune and Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels were the most efficacious in this regard. Other Marine Corps Commandants and various general education activity directors also contributed to the employment and continuance of these activities. The study concluded general education activities resulted from strong leaders with well founded philosophies and vision, and the aptitude to put their concepts into practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful and obligated to a great many people who assisted me in realizing dissertation.

I owe a special acknowledgment to the members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Larry French and Dr. Bert Wiswell provided encouragement and understanding as I encountered obstacles and difficulties. Dr. Hunt kindled my initial curiosity with historical research and provided support and incitement. To Dr. Ron McKeen and Dr. Harold Stubblefield, the committee co-chairmen, I owe a great deal of appreciation for the completion of this study. Dr. McKeen encouraged me to maintain focus, keep within the topic I chose, and continue to strive toward its completion. Dr. Stubblefield, my major advisor, is responsible for my choosing and completing an historical study of education. His acknowledged expertise in the field of history of adult education, firm but fair scholastic discipline, persistent motivation, and positive enthusiasm provided me confidence and drive to complete the effort, especially when it appeared to be hopelessly stalled.

In addition to my committee, Mr. Richard Long and Mr. Charles Smith of the Marine Corps Historical Center, Dr. Sydell Weiss of the Headquarters Marine Corps Educational

Department, Colonel Hazel Benn, USMC (Ret.), and Mr. Hadys Hendrix a World War I veteran, were instrumental in closing information gaps and guiding me to other sources during my research.

Although I visited several libraries in the Northern Virginia area I must give special thanks to two individuals. Mr. Bruce Martin of the Library of Congress was of great assistance to my research. He provided an initial study shelf and later a private study room within the Library of Congress. I was able to complete my research and begin much of the data treatment in that facility. Mr. Harold Brown of the Breckinridge Library at Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia provided me unlimited access within the library. He provided me admittance to the resources of the source materials and archives of the Breckinridge Library.

I acknowledge the patience and support of my wife Mary Ann, my daughters Laurie and Kate, my son Daniel, and my mother-in-law Mary Odom. Without them I surely would have never completed the dissertation.

A special thanks goes to the Gold Team Orthopedic Surgeons at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland especially Dr. Higgins and Dr. Ross for mending my decimated knee so that I could return to this study.

Finally, I dedicate the dissertation to my mother

Juanita Boland and to my father Wiley N. Boland who instilled in me the great work ethic, value of education, and respect for tradition inspiring the effort. Those values enabled me to commence, continue, and complete this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Early in 1739, the forerunner organization of the United States Marine Corp began within the American colonies. This new organization was small, established with a limited mission, and without any general education programs for its members. Two hundred and fifty three years later the Marine Corps is nearly two hundred thousand strong, has a specified mission, and administers a plethora of general education programs. This study traces the development the Marine Corps general education programs from 1739 to 1992.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The early colonial Marines was an organization void of any general education activities and with only nominal training and education for its members. A slow and determined yet unrelated series of training and education activities began to appear during the evolution of the Marine Corps and the positive aspects of the former activities were built upon.

The present Marine Corps education programs are really divided into two areas: (1) training and education and (2) general education. The Marine Corps provides detailed definitions and explanations for training and education and its training philosophy but does not define general education with similar specificity. Training in the Marine Corps is best characterized as "programmatic" or driven by specific funded programs. The Marine Corps training and education "program" includes both entry and post entry-level training. It consists of recruit training or officer acquisition training and the initial skill qualification training a Marine must receive to qualify in a military occupational specialty (MOS).

Although the terms "training and education" are combined and reside under the umbrella of education for Marines, these terms frequently cause confusion and misunderstanding. Masland and Radway have provided an insightful differentiation between training and education. Training identifies instruction that is oriented to a particular military specialty and designed to develop a technical skill and may be given directly to the individual or to organized units. Education implies instruction or individual study for the purpose of intellectual development and the cultivation of wisdom and judgement. Education is

usually provided in schools without regard to the student's job assignment in a particular unit. Whereas training is job-oriented, education goes far beyond the next assignment and seeks to prepare the individual for a lifetime career of service.[1]

General education is administered separately from the training and education programs. General education is important to the Marine Corps because it not only improves the individual participating in the program, but provides additional proficiencies to the Marine Corps. Currently these general education programs range from remedial reading and mathematic skills, the Basic Skills Education Program (BSEP), to the fully funded advanced degree program, the Special Education Program (SEP), and a multitude of off-duty programs. These general education programs rooted from various specific needs and developed into integral institutions.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Histories written about Marine Corps training and education efforts are focused on job or skills performance but very little has been written on the general education arena. The nature and circumstances that permitted general

education activities to be established, the educational style they took, their purposes, and the support measures required to sustain them have changed as the mission and size of the Marine Corps has evolved. General education, as the second type of education system within the Marine Corps, has been little studied and is commonly unknown. It is speculated that readiness training in today's Marine Corps requires more general education because of the technologies involved in preparing for war and accomplishing the mission of the Marine Corps. The problem investigated in this study centers around several broad questions: What general education programs and institutions were established in the Marine Corps? Who were the influential leaders affecting the establishments of these programs? What was the relationship of size and mission? What were the conditions surrounding their creation? What educational style was instituted within each activity? What purpose did they serve? What were the support measures required to sustain these programs? What has general education contributed to the Marine Corps?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to provide a description and chronology of the establishment of general education programs in the Marine Corps from the colonial period to the present. The study identifies the various general education programs, the influential leaders that affected their creation, and the contribution of each to the Marine Corps.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The problem investigated in this study posed several questions about general education activities in the Marine Corps. Several research questions guided the investigation during different periods of Marine Corps history. These are:

1. What were the general education initiatives in the Marine Corps of each period?

2. Who were the Marine Corps leaders and other individuals and what were their contributions to general education activities in the Marine Corps during each period?

3. What were the relationships of the changing size and/or mission of the Marine Corps and the general education activities in the Marine Corps?

4. What were the conditions surrounding the establishment of general education activities in the Marine Corps during each period?

5. What educational styles of general education activities were instituted in the Marine Corps during each period?

6. What were the purposes of general education activities in the Marine Corps during each period?

7. What were the support measures required of general education activities in the Marine Corps during each period?

8. What were the contributions of general education activities in the Marine Corps during each period?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

First, this study provides the first comprehensive chronology of general education activities of the Marine Corps. The findings of this study provide a documented history of the general education activities and institutions established during the periods of the Marine Corps' history. The study identified several periods of significant activity: the Colonial period to the Spanish-American War (1739-1898), the post-Spanish-American War to World War I period (1898-1919), the Vocational Schools Detachment period

(1919-1920), the Refinement period (1921-1948), and the post-World War II period (1948-1992).

Secondly, the study describes contributions of Marine Corps leaders and other individuals to general education activities in the Marine Corps. The programs indicated a consistent philosophical trend to provide general education opportunities to individuals to increase their knowledge and worth not only to the individual Marine, but also to the Marine Corps.

Thirdly, the study describes the relationship of the changing size and/or mission of the Marine Corps, the conditions surrounding the establishment of general education activities, the educational style of general education activities, the purpose of general education activities and the support measures required of general education activities in the Marine Corps. The findings of this study should also add to the body of knowledge of general education programs and activities history within the military Services of the United States.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

In this study the two major areas of education within the Marine Corps, training and education and general education. Training and education is defined in the following way: Marine Corps training is best characterized as "programmatic" and includes both entry and post entry-level training. Training and education continues throughout the career of each Marine and is normally closely aligned with general military knowledge and skills as well as specific military occupational specialty (MOS) skills. Training and education also includes Professional Military Education (PME). PME is the systematic and comprehensive process of developing the skills, knowledge and military judgment required to enhance the ability to deal with the increasingly complex responsibilities associated with Marine Corps duty and the responsibilities of higher grades. In contrast to specific MOS or billet-related skills, PME is the life-long study of the profession of arms within the framework of Marine air-ground task force operations. PME is normally acquired through structured self-study, professional reading, symposia, formal school attendance, and experiences gained in duty assignments. The fundamental purpose of PME is to assist all Marines in fulfilling their

personal responsibility for achieving operational competence.

General education includes those educational events that are not part of military skills training but are funded by the Marine Corps and combine formal civilian educational opportunities with military training and education to challenge the individuals to develop to his or heir greatest potential.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was not intended to be a comprehensive history of the United States Marine Corps or military education in America. It focused on the origin, educational style, purposes, support measures, and evolution of general education within the Marine Corps. Excluded from the study were the subjects of training, training programs, or certain Marine Corps school such as the School of Application, Field Officers' School, or Basic School programs.

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF MILITARY EDUCATION

Histories of military education were reviewed to determine the extent that general education within the

military had been investigated. Most of the histories of military education are about the oldest and largest services, the Army and Navy. The purpose of the review was to provide information about general education activities during the history of the Marine Corps and to direct this study. These histories showed that the patterns of educational programs developed within the larger Services were also followed by the Marine Corps as it grew in size and solidified its mission.

Early Studies

There are a few historical works written about the early activities involving training and education in the US military. These early studies describe the development of the first service academies, their curricula, activities, and continued efforts to ensure adequate training for an officer and eventually the enlisted men of the armed services.

One of the most often cited historical works on military education history and the forerunner of later works in the United States is Henry Barnard's Military Schools in France and Prussia. First written in 1862, it was revised in 1872 into a more comprehensive edition to include the

United States' military schools.[2] Barnard compared the military educational systems of France, Prussia, and several other European countries and described the strengths and weaknesses of these systems.

Part ten of Barnard's book is devoted to the military education system of the United States. He provides detailed accounting of the historical evolution of West Point, the Artillery School at Fort Monroe, the Virginia Military Institute, the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy, individual and corporate institutions, and the Naval Academy. He described the administration, financing, instruction, standards, evaluation policies and procedures, and demographics at the various schools.[3] His work is very comprehensive and one of the earliest histories of American military education.

Another older and important study, John Logan's Volunteer Soldier of America, published in 1887, is a study of the history of military education in the United States from the Revolutionary War until 1887. This work does not add much information beyond Barnard's meticulous chronicle of the Military Academy at West Point; however, it provides a much more thorough study of the Navy's early education history.

Another early work was Ira L. Reeves' Military Education in the United States, published in 1914. This is the first book to describe the Post School, the beginning of the Army's general education for enlisted men.[4] He also described the Army garrison schools that were provided as a means of technical continuing training and education for Army officers in subjects pertaining to the performance of their ordinary duties (to include warfare skills).

Reeves begins with a premise that the War of Independence was a "different sort" of war from any previous time and, therefore, required a uniquely American military education system.[5] He credits several individuals, groups, and institutions with the evolution of the US Army's unique military education and schools from the War of Independence through 1914. George Washington is credited as a "firm believer in military education"[6] and an advocate for a military academy for the education of Army officers.[7] Other important Army educational institutions include the School for Instruction of Infantry at Jefferson Barracks in 1826[8] and the "Free Military Schools" during the Civil War that provided additional officer accession for the Army.[9]

These early studies treated the development and establishment of Service academies and significant activities involving continuing training and education in

specific skills but gave little attention to an appraisal of general education activities.

Studies of World Wars I and II

After the Civil War the technological changes that helped shape the history of the United States also affected the military services. Several works describe the developments of training and education required to organize, equip, and lead the United States military through World Wars I and II. Thomas Stict's (1987) Cast-Off Youth: Policy and Training Methods from the Military Experience examined mental testing in World War I, which introduced the first use of the intelligence quotient (IQ) test as a criteria for training tracks.

Penn Borden's (1989) Civilian Indoctrination of the Military dealt with the broad concept of military-industrial interactions prior to and during World War I. Civilian agencies attached to the American Expeditionary Forces (AEF) for training and education served the purpose of enhancing mobilization, classification of recruits, training, vocational education, higher learning, and morality. The work of the civilian agencies had both positive and negative effects of civilian agencies. Some of the recruit testing

procedures used during World War I resulted in improper training assignments because of misuse or misunderstanding of the data from IQ testing. Borden indicated not all agencies and activities hindered the AEF in France; the YMCA, for example, provided camp activities, libraries, and off-duty education during the war.

There are a few studies dealing with military education during World War II. Alonzo Grace directed the study of wartime training and education for the American Council on Education (ACE) during World War II. The effort on the part of the Commission on Implication of Armed Services Education Programs was planned and initiated prior to the cessation of hostilities during the war. Grace summarized the study in Educational Lessons from Wartime Training, published in 1948. Grace reviewed methods in developing human resources, improving instruction, establishing special programs, contributions by higher education, and research in teaching soldiers. In general, Grace concluded that wartime military education had contributed to evolving educational policies and practices and large numbers of service people were introduced to education as a part of their adult experiences and would be motivated for more education if opportunities were offered to them.

One of the post-World War II studies for the ACE describing specific types of educational initiatives or programs established during the war is by Cyril Houle, who along with associates Burr, Hamilton, and Yale, wrote The Armed Services and Adult Education in 1947. This work examined programs such as the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), as well as a plethora of off-duty education programs. Houle stated there was a lack of military education histories and a lack of work involving new military education activities.[10] Many of these activities paralleled peacetime adult education enterprises and many of these programs were developed by civilian educators in the armed Services.[11] These educational programs were unique because of the magnitude of their resources, and motivational influences on the students.[12] The Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.) was one activity studied and was noted to be different in its organization and operation from the other Services correspondence schools.[13]

Studies on Professional Military Education

Since the end of World War II many of the studies dealing with military education were focused on professional military education, particularly in the requirements of

continuing education of military officers and leaders. J. W. Masland and L. I. Radway's Soldiers and Scholars was published in 1957, which is when the Soviet Union launched the Sputnik satellite. Their study of professional military education within the armed forces noted that an educational system to develop a well-qualified professional corps of officers should include a specialized curriculum, courses in the scientific and technical aspects of military affairs, and studies in the higher arts of strategy and warfare. Masland and Radway concluded that the armed forces had neglected higher education opportunities for its members.

Another study was H. F. Clark and H. S. Sloan's Classrooms in the Military, published in 1964. Clark and Sloan presented a short history of military education and described technology that drove the training and education of the armed forces particularly from 1860 to 1942. In 1965, J. C. Shelburn and K. J. Groves' Education in the Armed Forces classified subject matter for PME programs and described the historical events in the context of their contribution to PME system of 1965.

Morris Janowitz's (1960, 1971) critical work in The Professional Soldier describes the social and class stratification of military personnel and the effects of education, traditions, and the high level of specialization

required by modern technology. The Professional Soldier is an often cited modern work for improving professional military education programs.

A recent study by Clinton Anderson (1989) examines the US Army's education programs. The Army has an education/training strategy that provides the conceptual framework for planning, programming, budgeting, and conducting and/or overseeing all education and training necessary to accomplish its military task and to care for physiological needs of soldiers and their family members. Anderson reviewed the entire spectrum of education and training and then concentrated on the general education within the US Army. He identified several general education programs and activities from 1778 to 1989 that added to this study because the Marine Corps had parallel needs and similar corresponding programs were developed.

Marine Corps Studies

The principal Marine Corps history sources of information for this study include works such as Simmons (1976), Millett (1980), Clifford (1973), and Mersky (1983). There are only a few studies dealing with the history of Marine Corps general education; however, this limited

research focused primarily on the Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.). Theses by Pearson (1938), Flood (1948), and McIlroy (1986), a dissertation by Lawbraugh (1978), and an unpublished paper by Frances (1945) were histories found on the development of M.C.I. and other Marine Corps schools. Pearson traced the development of M.C.I. from 1920 through 1938. Flood continued Pearson's study to 1947. McIlroy is a more comprehensive study, beginning with the founding of M.C.I. and continuing through 1986. Frances' unpublished work contributes a general historical account of specific Marine Corps schools from 1891 to 1945, but adds little information of general education activities.

The review of the histories of military education lead this researcher to conclude that limited attention has been directed toward general education programs and institutions in the military, and, in particular general education activities of the Marine Corps. Although there are many studies about education within the armed forces in general and specifically about the Marine Corps, none dealt exclusively with the origin and development of general education within the Marine Corps.

RESEARCH METHOD

The historical research method was used to provide a means to reconstruct the past systematically and objectively by collecting, evaluating, verifying, and synthesizing evidence to establish facts and reach defensible conclusions. The researcher collected, categorized, analyzed, integrated, and synthesized data from a mass of data sources and interpreted this evidence in light of the contexts that the data emerged.[14] The data were treated according to several specific periods spanning from the colonial period of 1739 to 1992.

The various general education programs and activities were examined, as well as the issues and conditions surrounding their creation, their purpose, the direction and support features required to continue the programs, and the contribution of each to the Marine Corps. The purpose of such an examination was to answer several research questions to provide a description and chronology of the establishment of general education programs and activities in the Marine Corps during its history. This study combined chronology and thematic approaches so that each chapter covers a discreet time period. The organization of the chapters are thematic.

Sources of Data

There were four major sources of data for this study: primary, unpublished materials, published materials, and human. The archives of five major depositories were used: the Marine Corps Historical Center in Washington, D.C.; the National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C.; the Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia; the National Archives, Washington, D.C.; and the Library of Congress, Washington D.C. The personal papers and Oral History collections held by the History and Museums Division of the Marine Corps Historical Center also provided primary and secondary source materials.

The materials most frequently used were books, journals, magazines, and newspapers. Three journals in particular were helpful in tracing the progress of the Navy-Marine Corps organizational conflicts and the history of general education activities within the Marine Corps. These are Proceedings, the Army and Navy Journal, Leatherneck, and the Marine Corps Gazette. The newsletter of the Marine Corps Historical Program, Fortitudine, and the World War I newspaper, Stars and Stripes, proved helpful.

Interviews were conducted with Richard Long, Charles Smith, Colonel Hazel Benn, USMC, Ret., Sydell Weiss, and

Hadys D. Henderson. Long, Smith, Benn, Weiss, and Hendrix provided information about the issues and conditions that affected the Marine Corps at the time the of the creation of many general education activities. In addition, Benn provided personal copies of many orders, directives, associated letters, memoranda, and official papers directly dealing with general education activities in the Marine Corps. Weiss provided recent information dealing with off-duty education programs within the Marine Corps. Long and Smith are on staff at the Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. Colonel Benn served on active duty, personally contributed to programs and interacted with the persons referenced within the study. Weiss is the Director of Marine Corps Education, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C. Henderson is a Marine combat veteran of World War I and provided information about training and education during his tenure in the Marine Corps.

Collection of Data

There were two methods used to collect the data from the four sources for this study. One method involved visiting the locations of sources where the unpublished,

published, and official documentation materials were collected reviewed, read, and notes were taken. The data collected was used to identify persons, events, motivations, and context of the events surrounding the establishment and support of general education activities during the history of the Marine Corps. The other method used to collect the data for this study was interviewing persons and notes taken, analyzed, and interpreted.

The guidelines described in the Virginia Tech Policies and Procedures (1991-1992) were considered in order to protect the persons interviewed. All persons were told of their right to withdraw from the study at any time, confidentiality of their responses, and their identities were to be used in the introduction of the study. All persons were afforded an opportunity to review their responses and notes collected as result of their interview. The interview guide is Appendix A of the study.

Analysis of Data

The data was collected from sources and arranged to sort, categorize, compare, and interpret. The arrangement facilitated identification of programs, activities, institutions, and influential individuals affecting general

education activities that emerged in the Marine Corps from the colonial period to the present. Appendix C contains a chronological listing of the data collected in the study. Figure 1 depicts the matrix used for data analysis. The horizontal axis depicts the periods that general education activities in the Marine Corps were established. The vertical axis depicts the internal and external forces that affected general education activities. Each data element was categorized into a particular time period. The data in each period was then examined in light of the internal and external forces: influential leader(s), the relationship of the size and mission of the Marine Corps during the period, the conditions permitting general educational programs and activities to be established, the educational style and purposes of general educational programs and activities, the support measures required for general education programs and activities, and the contribution of each. A narrative was written to explain the findings and relationship within the study. Sources were cross-referenced and discrepancies between them are specifically detailed in the study.

DATA TREATMENT MATRIX

TIME PERIODS / INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FORCES	COLONIAL PERIOD TO THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR 1739-1898	POST SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR TO WORLD WAR I 1898-1919	VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS DETACHMENT 1919-1920	REFINEMENT PERIOD 1920-1948	POST-WORLD WAR II 1948-1992
INFLUENTIAL LEADERS					
RELATIONSHIP OF SIZE AND MISSION					
CONDITIONS SURROUNDING THEIR CREATION					
EDUCATIONAL STYLE OF EACH ACTIVITY					
PURPOSES OF EACH ACTIVITY					
SUPPORT MEASURES					
CONTRIBUTION OF EACH ACTIVITY					

FIGURE 1

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter one presents a statement of the problem, its background, its purpose, and its significance. It also advances the research questions, defines terms, states the objectives of the study, sets forth the organization and methodology of the study, and reviews relevant historiography.

Chapter two describes development of general educational programs and institutions within the Marine Corps and people who provided leadership prior to 1898.

Chapter three discusses the factors that stabilized the mission of the Marine Corps and provided a basis for general education. The Marine Corps expended great effort to secure a unique mission from 1898 to 1919 and by so doing unique training and education requirements developed. The chapter also discusses models and philosophies affecting the establishment of general education activities while the Marine Corps was coming to grips with its own identity, increasing its size, dealing with training requirements thrust upon it by technological changes, and attempting to professionalize its order.

Chapter four reports the most significant general education event in the Marine Corps history, the development

of the Marine Corps Institute from 1919-1920.

Chapter five describes the Marine Corps general education activities during a second major period from 1920-1948, with particular emphasis on the Vocational Schools Detachment.

Chapter six describes general education in the Marine Corps from 1948-1992. During this period the reorganization of the military structure, government legislation, the all-volunteer force, the continuing revolution in technology, and the continuing evolution of the Marine Corps affected the needs of general education within the Marine Corps.

Chapter seven summarizes the findings, makes conclusions about the points raised in the research questions, and suggests possible future research topics. The study of significant general education programs, the individuals and events that promoted these attitudes and the results of these attitudes have provided a chronology of the development of general education in the Marine Corps from the colonial period to the present.

NOTES

1. J. W. Masland and L. I. Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 50-51.

2. Henry Barnard, Military Schools and Courses of Instruction in the Sciences and Art of War, in France, Prussia, Sweden, Switzerland, Sardinia, England, and the United States, (New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1972), 2.

3. Ibid, 466.

4. Ira L. Reeves, Military Education in the United States, (Burlington: The Free Press, 1914), 19.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid, 21.

8. Ibid, 22-23.

9. Ibid, 26.

10. Cyril O. Houle, Elbert W. Burr, Thomas H. Hamilton, and John R. Yale, The Armed Services and Adult Education, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947), 8.

11. Ibid, 79.

12. Ibid, 4.

13. Ibid, 5, 75-80.

14. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged, (Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1988), 1073, Philip P. Wiener, ed., Dictionary of the History of Ideas, Vol II, (New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1973), 464, Jacques Barzum and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher, (New York: Hartcourt Brace Javanovich Publishers, 1985), 47, 191, and 261, Edwin H. Carr, What is History?, (New York: Random House, 1962), 14 and 35, Leonard M. Marsak, The Nature of Historical Inquiry,

(New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), 104, and Peter Reason and John Rowan, "Issues of Validity in New Paradigm Research," in Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research, eds, Peter Reason and John Rowan, (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 1981), 239-250.

The concept of this study's data analysis or treatment relies upon the critical examination of the sources, the selection of particulars from the authentic materials, and the synthesis of particulars into a narrative that will stand the test of critical methods. The data analysis or treatment is a means of dealing with a succession of books, authors, and schools of thought. Treatment also encompasses the study of man's sense of the past as well as the associated relationships of the present and past generation. Barzum and Graff parallel this concept adding the researcher's mental discipline is accomplished through researching, interpreting, and writing history.

Carr explains historical writing is the compilation of a minimum number of irrefutable and objective facts and a means of bringing facts of the past into the present. Continuous interaction between the researcher and the facts and an unending dialogue between the present and the past are germane to this study's data treatment. Marsak views historical writing as comparison. He indicates the researcher attempts to define different historical phenomena in relation to one another, versus relation to some absolute standard. Merriam and Simpson point out validity also affects the relationship between the knower and what is to be known.

The researcher must analytically study, interpret, and write to provide clues and answers to particular events or activities. The researcher must write scholarly, as the treatment is achieved. Barzum and Graff conclude that successive revisions of an event or activity do not cancel each other out; they become additive and the body of knowledge is replete.

CHAPTER II

HOW EDUCATION AND TRAINING DEVELOPED IN THE MARINE CORPS FROM THE COLONIAL PERIOD TO THE SPANISH AMERICAN WAR

The United States Marine Corps began in 1781 as a unit subservient of the Navy, administered under the Navy Department, and maintained an ambiguous relationship with the Navy. The chapter traces the origin of Colonial and United States Marines, development until the Spanish American War, scope of mission, and size. In this context the development of general educational activities occurred, evident in the larger and specific mission oriented Services, yet delayed for the Marine Corps. The chapter then describes the development of general educational programs and institutions within the Marine Corps and persons who provided leadership during this period prior to 1898.

COMMENCING A SEARCH FOR A UNIQUE MISSION

Versatility and flexibility, well-known attributes of today's Marine Corps, have their origin in the Colonial Period.[1] The earliest organization of Colonial Marines date from approximately 1739, when the British government asked

the American colonies to assist in forming four regiments of Marines for service. These were the first "American" Marines, and the regiments formed were to prosecute a naval campaign against the Spanish colonies in the Caribbean. Virginia's Governor William Gooch raised, organized, trained, and equipped about 3000 Colonial Marines from Virginia and other neighboring colonies.[2] These Marines were designated the "43rd Regiment of Foot," but were also known as "Gooch's Marines."[3] One noted person who served in Gooch's regiment was Lawrence Washington, the older half-brother of George Washington.[4] These first Marines of 250 years ago were formed only for the circumstance at hand and were disbanded with the recall of the expedition.[5]

Americans again encountered service as Marines aboard the British fleet during the Seven Years' War in 1763. There was a lack of a naval tradition, military discipline, and limited resources; however, several of the colonies maintained their own Marines along with Army and Naval forces.[6] These were known as the "original eight" and included Connecticut, Massachusetts. Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia.[7]

The Second Continental Congress appointed a committee in 1775 to study a proposal to carry out a landing operation

by Continental troops in British Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotia Committee presented a resolution to raise two battalions of Marines for such an operation.[8] On November 10, 1775 the Second Continental Congress resolved that two battalions of American Marines be raised to serve during the ongoing war between Great Britain and the North American colonies.[9] The Congress authorized "that particular care be taken that no persons be appointed to office or enlisted into said Battalions, but such as are good seamen, or so acquainted with maritime affairs as to be able to serve to advantage by sea, when required."[10] By these actions the Second Continental Congress provided for Marines, but it did not stipulate a specific mission for them, except to say that they should be able to "to serve to advantage by sea." This omission of mission was perhaps intentional since "Marines" were understood to serve aboard ships even though the committee that formulated the resolution had other intentions for Marines.[11]

In 1776 a landing party of Marines carried out the first amphibious operation when they seized New Providence in the Bahamas to acquire much needed munitions for the Continental forces.[12] This was a mission different from the duties Marines normally performed aboard ships. Again in 1776 a battalion of three companies of Continental Marines

were assigned to Washington's army during the Trenton-Princeton campaigns as infantry troops. For Marines to reinforce the Army for land operations appeared as an additional mission for Marines in the Revolutionary War and continued to the present.[13] The mission of Marines was certainly not clear and would be a contentious issue for many years.

The legislation of 1775 originally authorized a Corps of Marines; however, the United States Marine Corps was not firmly established into the framework of the United States military system until July 11, 1798.[14] Prior to 1798, both the Army and the Navy were separate Services under one department and one Cabinet Secretary: the Secretary of War.[15] On April 30, 1798, an act to "establish an Executive Department to be denominated as the Department of the Navy" was passed by the Congress. This act established distinct and separate departments of War and Navy.[16]

In 1798 the Marine Corps then came directly under the President, but had an unusual designation as an integral part of the U.S. Navy or the U.S. Army, depending on which Service it was assigned to for a particular mission.[17] Marines were subject to Naval Regulations while aboard ship and the Articles of War while ashore.[18] The Marine Corps' sole duties were policing Naval ships and installations and

leading landing parties in time of war.[19] Neither the Secretary of War nor the Secretary of the Navy had full control over or administered the Marine Corps. The War Department was reluctant to assist the Navy Department in the upkeep of their "own regiment of Marines."[20]

On June 30, 1834, an Act passed for the "better organization of the Marine Corps" officially made the Marine Corps a part of the Navy Department.[21] This provision recognized, however, that Marines could be "detached for service with the Army" when authorized by the President.[22] The word "role" or "mission" neither appear in legislation nor executive directives pertaining to the Marine Corps.[23] The Marine Corps mission remained vague.

The Marine Corps during the period from 1739 to 1898 was relatively small. Service size vacillated throughout this period from the Continental Congress authorization and Revolutionary War high of about 2,231 in 1783 to a low of 312 in 1798. The highest authorization was 4,167 during the Civil War and the period ended with Marine Corps strength of 2,149 in 1898 prior to the Spanish American War.[24] Appendix B contains year end strength levels of the Marine Corps and will help the reader understand the relative small size of this Service.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF COLONIAL AND EARLY UNITED STATES MARINES

The Marine Corps' educational evolution followed a similar route as that of the other Services with the exception of a Service Academy. By the Spanish American War the Marine Corps had begun identifying a mission, had increased its size, and most significantly, had established its first formal institutionalized educational activity.

Marine Corps training and educational programs also date from approximately 1739, when the American colonies formed four regiments of Marines.[25] The training and educational requirements for this force of mostly impressed men were slight and poorly executed by amateur officers. The training emulated the manner that the British trained their troops at the time.[26] There is no data indicating any general education was provided to the early Marines.

Americans again served as Marines in 1763. There was little money or time spent on training and education in any of the eight colonies with Marine forces.[27] The two battalions of American Marines, established in 1775 by the Continental Congress to serve the endeavor of the ongoing Revolutionary War with Great Britain, trained much in the same manner as they had in colonial Marines of the original

eight, but with more pride and discipline.[28] This colonial Marine venture also lacked any general education.

The establishment of the United States Marine Corps in 1798 and its subordination under both the Army and Navy invited many conflicts among these Services and adversely affected training and educational requirements and education opportunities for Marine Corps personnel.[29] The only advantage to this situation was the ability of the Marine Corps to use the Army's drill manual, Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States, which was first published for Washington's Army in 1776.[30] This provided the Marine Corps with a standard training media for their basic training requirements.

In 1808, then Colonel Commandant Franklin Wharton published an order establishing the first formal training and education activity specifically for Marines at the Headquarters of the Marine Corps in Washington, D.C. His order stated that the Headquarters was "the school where young officers and recruits are to be instructed in various duties that they may be called upon to perform."[31] This was a part of Wharton's vision of reorganizing the Marine Corps as a separate professional military institution and the first effort for its own Service-level training and education activity.

Legislation to "increase the Navy of the United States" approved January 2, 1813 began the schoolmaster program of training and education in the Navy. Sections of the legislation enumerated one schoolmaster who was to be appointed by each ship's captain and to be paid twenty-five dollars per month and two rations per day.[32] The Navy placed these schoolmasters aboard many ships, including the receiving ships that provided skills training to young sailors and officers alike.[33] Much of this training was inadequate because of the paucity of available training time, poor teaching, and resistance from ships' captains. While ships were in port, training was even more difficult to accomplish. The program had great intentions; however, Marines were excluded from participating in the program.

This schoolmaster system of training in the Navy did not result in a standardized system of training and education until the 1840's when William Chauvenet, a graduate of Yale, took control of a school designed to prepare senior midshipmen for examination requirements for lieutenant.[34] "The Asylum School" was set up in the Philadelphia Naval Asylum, an institution for old and indigent sailors. Chauvenet's school provided a standard program for midshipmen in preparation of the Lieutenant examination. That same year the school ship program began

with the launching of the training ship U.S.S. Somers with its 120 trainees.[35] The Navy began at this point to institutionalize and standardize training and education throughout the Navy. The Marine Corps had not yet begun a Service-wide training activity of any type.

There were several initiatives taken for the training of enlisted Marines but these were not standardized. In 1823, the Marine Corps requested that Marines be included into classes dealing with general educational topics that were provided aboard many ships in the Navy schoolmaster program. This request was rejected and the practice of excluding Marines continued for the next 90 years, with schoolmasters available to the sailors and Naval officers exclusively.[36] Marines were left to their own training and education, including any type of general education on these ships. The ship's captain still made the final decision on each ship, but tended to segregate the Marines training from that of Navy personnel training.[37]

In 1834 an Act for the "better organization of the Marine Corps" officially made the Marine Corps a part of the Navy Department.[38] Now the Marine Corps did not have to continue to request training and education funding from the two Service departments that previously refused to acknowledged responsibility. This Act increased the size of

the Corps and also provided direct funding for training and education from the Secretary of the Navy.[39] This was a significant development because the training goals and opportunities were no longer divided between two Services.

COMMANDANT ARCHIBALD HENDERSON'S EMERGING MARINE CORPS TRAINING AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Marines had received limited training and education by various means; however, there had been no exclusive Marine Corps training programs beyond those of Commandant Wharton. The most important proponent of Marine Corps education following its placement exclusively into the Department of the Navy in 1834 to 1891 was Commandant Archibald Henderson. Henderson was responsible for several training and education initiatives.

In 1839 the first general education effort for the Marine Corps emerged at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. when Commandant Archibald Henderson established a school for young Marine Band apprentices for their general education.[40] This school and its basic education opportunities were available to older Marines at the Barracks as well. Henderson requested additional funding to expand this program throughout the Marine Corps, but the education

program never expanded beyond the Washington Marine Barracks and the Marine Band apprentices.[41]

One of the apprentice school's most famous students, John Philip Sousa, indicated that he was indebted for both musical and academic education during 1868 while in the apprentice program. One dollar per month was deducted from his pay for "schooling," as it was called, and an additional two dollars was deducted for musical training. His schooling technically was for the purpose of learning to "read, write, and cipher as far as the single rule of three."[42] This short-lived activity was one of the few general education activities embedded within the training and educational activities of the Marine Corps.

Commandant Henderson also envisioned a more professional Marine Corps as an institution. This vision included more standardized training and education. In 1840, Commandant Henderson directed another new policy to train all newly-appointed officers at the Headquarters of the Marine Corps in Washington, D.C.[43] He personally saw that each new officer was given "proper training."[44] Because of its small size, individualized training was feasible within the Marine Corps.

In 1842 after observing the Navy recruiting young boys into service aboard ships, Henderson requested that a

proportionate number of recruits be added to the end strength of the Marine Corps so that young boys could also be enlisted. The Adjutant General of the Marine Corps made the formal request to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy passed the question to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General, in his opinion, indicated that the request would be denied because while the Navy provided training in many maritime skills and education for the young boys recruited the Marine Corps had "no training" suitable for the education of young boys.[45] This opinion of Marine Corps training was a concern to Commandant Henderson.

In 1847, with equal concern for the quality and training requirements for officer and enlisted Marines, Henderson systematized and published the first instructions for recruiting, the Regulations for the Recruiting Service of the United States Marine Corps. The instructions opened with this comment: "No man is wanted who does not come voluntarily to the standard of his country."[46] Henderson's efforts began to "mold" what Marines and their officers would become and began to standardize all training and education activities within the Marine Corps.

Henderson also installed another type of training at the headquarters in 1857: instruction in artillery.[47] In the summer of 1857, he had detailed Lieutenant Israel Green

to West Point to study artillery. When Green returned to Washington, Henderson directed him to implement a training program for instruction in artillery as a means to further improve the Corps.[48] Henderson also recruited West Point graduates whenever, as frequently happened, the Army could not find room for them. This practice of acquiring excess West Point graduates and commissioning them as Marine Corps officers became the law in the early 1900's.[49] This practice brought the West Point professionalization attitudes into the Corps and helped Henderson with his agenda for the professionalization of the Marine Corps.

Until July 25, 1861, Marines were commissioned by various means and there were no real standards or qualifications.[50] Normally individuals were recommended by someone of importance or an acquaintance of a House Representative or Senator and by means of their written letter to the Secretary of the Navy or President.[51] After consultation with the Headquarters of the Marine Corps, a commission was authorized by the Congress. Some were commissioned and the Marine Corps was informed after the fact. There was no education standard or maritime background required, and often officers drifted between the Army and the Marine Corps with transfers back and forth.[52] In 1861 the Congress then established a standard practice of

acquisition of Marine Corps officers by allowing only men who were between the ages of 20 and 25 and who passed a professional examination. The Secretary of the Navy was authorized to draft and administer the test.[53] This action helped improve the quality of officers entering the Marine Corps.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES OF THE 1880'S

The next milestone occurred in 1882 when the Congress required the Marine Corps to obtain some of its officers from the Naval Academy in addition to West Point--a policy viewed as another step toward greater professionalization.[54] The Marine Corps continued to operate a school for newly commissioned officers now located in Portsmouth, Virginia. The school, made up of a few Naval Academy graduates with graduates of civilian colleges, were effectively presented classes and the professional manner of operation with no favoritism displayed toward any person.[55] This idea of standardized training was not limited to the officer corps; there were improvements in enlisted training and education as well. Before 1885, all recruits were "rendezvoused" at either Philadelphia, New York, Boston, or Mare Island. They were sent to a Marine Barracks for "polishing before being

drafted to a ship's detachment."[56] But in 1885 with the publication of the Marines Manual, the Marine Corps' first handbook on general military subjects, training for enlisted recruits was regulated and standardized .[57] When on shore duty, Marines trained as directed by the Marines Manual in classes called the school of the soldier, company, and battalion. The actual training classes included skirmishes, target practice, bayonet exercises, and ceremonies (drill and precision marching) for the individual, company, and battalion respectively. While at sea, these subjects were continued when possible, but Marines also had to practice the great gun or artillery drill, as well as swimming, boats, signals, and broadsword. Each of the Marine Corps training posts were inspected to ensure standard training.[58]

The Marine Corps continued refining its military skills training, including inspecting the accounting of their military skills training as well as making some effort in standardizing training.[59] The public was aware of the intense training that Marines were subjected to during the later nineteenth century. An article from the Manchester Union in 1885 described it:

> the life of a Marine is not all sunshine and neither is it a 'softsnap,' as many have been led to believe, but instead they are rushed from one end of the world to the other and put through a course of training that usually makes them think

> of 'home, sweet, home' before they have been in the service many months. They are drilled to a science.[60]

To complement the emerging standardized system of officer training and education, Commandant Charles G. McGawley in 1888 endorsed a policy on an examination program for promotion of Marine Corps officers to ensure that they had acquired skills and knowledge required of the rank that they were about to enter. These examinations continued for several years.[61]

FORMAL TRAINING AND EDUCATION ARRIVES: THE SCHOOL OF APPLICATION

The Army was the first Service to provide a means of continuing training and education and the Marine Corps followed this model as their size and requirements mandated. After the establishment of West Point, the Army realized a need to continue training and education for officers and a means of training enlisted men in the changes in technology and tactics. The Army began to establish formal training and education activities for the purpose of continuing education for officers and enlisted men. These activities were operated from particular post and garrison schools throughout the country.[62] The first of these formal Army

training and education activities, an "Army School of Practice," began in 1823. The school of practice provided the means to continue training and education in the art of warfare, particularly infantry and calvary. In 1824 the School of Artillery was established at Fortress Monroe in Virginia. This particular training and education activity was the first formal schooling for enlisted Army personnel beyond entry-level and on-the-job training. In 1826 the School for the Instruction of Infantry, another activity in continuing education, began at Jefferson Barracks near St. Louis. These efforts toward providing continuing education were significant and persisted until the Civil War, when the Army's educational objectives were reassessed.[63]

In January 1891, the Marine Corps training and education programs received new impetus by Secretary of the Navy B. F. Tracy's appointment of Colonel Charles Heywood to the Commandant of the Marine Corps. Heywood was aware of the efforts of his predecessor and decided to act on the training priorities established during his predecessor McGawley's tenure as Commandant.[64] The priorities included establishing an apprentice system to maintain enlisted Marine strength and the formation of a practical school of application for officers and Marines in electricity, torpedoes, gunnery, and drill.[65]

A significant episode of training and education was the Marine Corps' School of Application that began in 1891 at Annapolis. The School of Application was an initiative of Commandant Heywood, approved by the Secretary of the Navy Tracy, and announced via Marine Corps General Order Number 1 of May 1, 1891.[66] This was a formal school for the training and education of commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted personnel in the Marine Corps.[67]

The first Director of Instruction for the School of Application was Captain Daniel Pratt Mannix.[68] Mannix was the son of an Irish immigrant, enlisted in the Navy during the Civil War, and received a commission in the Marine Corps in 1865. He was very learned in Naval warfare having graduated from both the Navy's Torpedo School and the Army's Artillery School and served as an instructor to the Chinese Navy from 1881 to 1885. He returned to the Marine Corps Headquarters in 1891 and began campaigning for reforms and professional training within the Marine Corps.[69]

Seven departments were established within the school to provide instruction into seven basic areas: infantry, artillery, administration and sea service, law, torpedoes, engineering, and military art. The texts used in the courses of study included many of the contemporary classics in military law, infantry and artillery, naval gunnery,

tactics, signal, and intelligence. This entire curriculum was developed by Mannix utilizing his ingenuity and imagination.[70]

Heywood and Mannix viewed the School of Application as the center for a system of satellite schools to be established at every Marine Post. A modified course based upon the curriculum outline was proposed for the branch schools. A circular published in July 1891 encouraged Marine Commanders at all shore establishments to carry out the course of instruction prescribed by the General Order, as much as was practicable, for the officers and Marines at each post.[71]

The School of Application began slowly with only seven newly commissioned officers in its first class. Sixty enlisted Marines joined the second class of five newly commissioned officers. By the beginning of the third class in 1893, the school had attained a minor reputation for its thoroughness of instruction in both theory and practice.[72] Mannix died in February 1894; however, the program continued to flourish after his death and remained in operation until the Spanish-American War.[73]

Other initiatives of Commandant Heywood were the establishment of a regular system of target practice and adopting the Good Conduct medal program for the betterment

of the discipline of the Marine Corps. This medal was presented to enlisted Marines only. These activities were to further standardize training and education in the case of target practice and further professionalization in the case of the Good Conduct Medal.

Under Commandant Heywood's administration (1888-1903), the increased efficiency of the Marine Corps demonstrated to the Navy how absolutely essential the Marine Corps was as an auxiliary component to the Naval Service. He increased the Marine Corps' number of posts from twelve to twenty-one, and its size from 75 officers and 2074 enlisted to 278 officers and 7,532 enlisted.[74] His actions not only continued the Marine Corps' professionalization, but further demonstrated the need for more Marine Corps military skills training and education and its own professional military education.

SUMMARY

The earliest established organization of colonial Marines was in 1739, followed by others in 1763. These early Marine organizations had few assets or time to spend on training and education and nothing for general education. The training and education for Marines during the Revolutionary War remained rudimentary, but more pride and

discipline included. These pre-United States Marine Corps organizations were the forerunner of today's Marines and the total absence of general education within their time became remedied as the Marine Corps evolved.

The subordination of the United States Marine Corps by the Army and Navy did not provide any relief for general education needs. Once Commandant Wharton established the Marine Corps' first formal training and education program in 1808, the training and education and general education needs began to be reviewed. The Navy's schoolmaster program, which began in 1823, excluded Marine participation. Marines had to provide for their own general education needs, within their small units or individually.

Following the official inclusion into the Navy Department in 1834, the Marine Corps could request funds for training from its own Service Department. The Marine Corps was no longer being bureaucratically passed between the War and Navy Departments without resolution of their requests.

In 1839, the Marine Corps encountered its first general education effort when Commandant Henderson established a school for Marine Corps Band apprentices and Marine serving at the Marine Corps Barracks, Washington, D.C. This school provided general education primarily for young boys in the band but was also available for Marines assigned at the

barracks. Henderson also contributed to standardizing Marine Corps training and education and general education with other programs and regulations throughout his tenure from 1820-1859.

The publication of the Marine Manual in 1805, directed by Commandant Heywood, regulated and standardized recruit training and education. Another significant effort to standardize training and education for entry-level officers was established in 1891--The School of Application. Following 1891, training and education was also standardized for enlisted recruits and entry-level officer, throughout their career. Service-level support of these stable and institutionalized training and education programs set the ground work for all Marine Corps training and education and general education programs that followed.

The four major contributions to the origin and development of Marine Corps general education are Wharton's formal training and education order, Henderson's general educational program establishment, Heywood's publication of the Marine Corps Handbook, and Heywood's initiation of the School of Application. All four exhibit the fundamental enthusiasm and initiative necessary to fulfil training and education needs, to include general education activities.

But lack of institutional support dragged these efforts, and the first two were short lived.

Before these efforts and these individuals' leadership, Marines were excluded from educational activity. Marines received minimal standardized training with limited funds. Although Marines were assigned to support Army and Navy organizations and missions, neither Service claimed responsibility or sponsorship for Marine education. The law officially assigning the Marine Corps to the Navy Department affixed the sponsorship and provided funds for standardized Marine Corps military skills training, professional education, and general education.

Professional military schooling made considerable progress in training and education as well as general educational efforts among all the Services before the Spanish-American War began. The Marine Corps had begun professionalization and "self-betterment" for individual Marines.[75] The status of general education activity was very limited; however, efforts were to continue.

NOTES

1. Thomas G. Rowe, Earnest H. Giusti, John H. Johnstone, and Benis M. Frank, A History of Marine Corps Roles and Missions: 1775-1962, (Washington: Historical Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, 1962), 1, Henry Barnard, Military Schools and Courses of Instruction in the Science and Art of War in France, Prussia, Austria, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, Sardinia, England, and the United States, (New York: E. Steiger New York, 1969), 276, J. S. O'Rourke, Military Leadership for the 1990's and Beyond", Military Review, Vol. 65, 1985, 19, Richard A. Preston, "Perspectives in the History of Military Education and Professionalism", The Harmon Memorial Lectures in Military History, Number 22, United States Air Force Academy, 1980, 6. Dating from before the Revolutionary War, Marines have performed a wide variety of roles and missions in the national interest. However, the principal influence of all military schooling, including that of the United States, had its genesis in France. In 1604, in an effort to systematically prepare young gentlemen for a role in the officer corps of the French Army, King Henry IV founded a military school in La Fleche, France. This school was established primarily for the training of the sons of noblemen and the orphans of military officers. Because of his interest in quality education, King Henry IV entrusted the instruction to the leading educators of the day, the Jesuits. This represented the first effort to institutionalize the specific training of military personnel. The school had a structured curricula and a standard educational method of instruction. The French followed up this initiative in military education with the first non-technical military academy, the Ecole Royale Militaire in Paris, which was founded in 1751 by King Louis XV. Louis XV wanted to be assured that the attitudes of the officers in the French Army were those of professional military students, and not those of romantic heroes. These early efforts on the part of the French became the paradigm for military education in many European countries as well as in the United States.

2. Allan R. Millett, Semper Fidelis: The History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company Inc., 1980), 4, Charles R. Smith, Marines in the Revolution: A History of the Continental Marines in the American Revolution 1775-1783, History and Museum

Division, Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, Washington D.C., 1975, 1-3, Allan R. Millett and Peter Maslowski, For The Common Defense: A Military History of the United States of America, (New York: Free Press, 1984), 33-34 and Jack Murphy, History of U.S. Marines, (Greenwich: Brompton Book Corporation, 1984), 12. Millett, Smith, Millett and Maslowski, and Murphy provide some rare information on the early beginnings of "Marines" in America. British Marines were practically disbanded in 1713 after the Peace of Utrecht. The outbreak of hostilities with Spain in 1739 prompted King George II to re-establish the Marines. Colonel Alexander Spotswood of Virginia was to command three regiments of 1100 men in each. Spotswood died on the eve of the expedition that was to execute the naval campaign against Spain and her possessions and Governor Gooch was placed in command. This was known as the War of Jenkin's Ear and meld into the War of as Austrian Succession in Europe that ended in 1744. American losses were very heavy, but their accomplishments included an attack on Cartagena, Spain, an assault to capture Guantanamo Bay, Cuba for the British Fleet, and several other skirmishes in the Caribbean.

3. Murphy, 12.

4. Edwin H. Simmons, The United States Marine Corps, (New York: Viking Press, 197), 2. Lawrence Washington discussed his service with the Marines with his brother George. George Washington had established an awareness of the capabilities of Marines and their need for autonomy in action. For these reasons, George Washington resisted incorporating Marines into his Continental Army. During the few "joint" Army-Marine campaigns of the Revolutionary War, Washington permitted the Marines to maintain their autonomy and act as a separate component. Another interesting bit of trivia was the fact that Admiral Vernon, the fleet commander for the Caribbean campaign that Lawrence Washington had served, had so impressed Lawrence that after inviting Vernon to his Virginia home and estate, he renamed it Mount Vernon. George never changed the name after he had inherited the estate following Lawrence's death.

5. Millett, 4.

6. Smith, 3.

7. Simmons, 17 and Ira L. Reeves, Military Education in the United States, (Burlington: Free Press, 1914), 19. Military training and education in colonial America was imported directly from Europe by the deployed imperial forces stationed in the North American colonies. As the colonies began to band together to defend their new homeland European officers and soldiers were commissioned to establish the core of militia and to train the colonists. European military training and education influence was present. During the Revolutionary War, the need for trained and educated leaders, organizers, disciplinarians, and teachers was met by conferring positions of military rank in functional areas to educated and experienced foreign soldiers. Some of these soldiers and educators included Major General Johann DeKalb of Germany, Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski of Poland, Brigadier General Thaddeus Kosciusko of Poland, and Major General Marquis de Lafayette of France.

8. Edwin T. Turnbladh, "The Committee on Nova Scotia," Leatherneck, November, 1960, 35.

9. J. Robert Moskin, The United States Marine Corps Story, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977), 34-35.

10. Edwin M. McClellan, History of the United States Marine Corps, (Washington: Historical Section, Headquarters Marine Corps, 1931), Chapter 3, 15.

11. Turnbladh, Ibid.

12. Clyde H. Metcalf, A History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939), 13-15, 20-21.

13. McClellan, Chapter 4, 24-27.

14. Simmons, 17.

15. John A. Logan, The Voluntary Soldier of America, (New York: Arno Press, 1979, reprint of Chicago: R.S. Peale, 1887), 266.

16. Simmons, 17 and Logan, 266.

17. Kenneth J. Clifford, Amphibious Warfare Development in Britain and America from 1920-1940, (Laurous: Englewood, Inc., 1983), 20.

18. E. N. McClellan, "From 1783-1798", Marine Corps Gazette, Volume 7, September, 1922, 273-286.

19. Ibid.

20. Robert Debs Heinl, Soldiers of the Sea: The United States Marine Corps 1775-1962, (Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1962), 26-27.

21. Simmons, 38.

22. Ibid and "An Act for the Better Organization of the United States Marine Corps," Statute 4, 312.

23. Rowe, Giusti, Johnstone, and Frank, 1.

24. Simmons, 63 and 75.

25. Millett, 4.

26. Simmons, 2.

27. Smith, 3.

28. Simmons, 17 and Logan, 266.

29. Clifford, 20, Philip S. Foner, Morale Education in the American Army, (New York: International Publishers, 1944), 16-18, and Harry Emerson Wildes, Valley Forge, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1938), 257. General education in the United States military had its origin in the American Revolution with George Washington and it involved a conflict with one issue, the Army's right to disseminate information for general knowledge and morale. Throughout the war, the British Torries published pamphlets and papers for the purposes of propaganda and misinformation targeted at the Continental Army. In 1777 Washington realized a need for accurate and timely information and "news" for the troops of the Continental Army. Washington asked the Congress for a printing press, supplies, and personnel to enable his headquarters to provide timely and accurate information and news to the Army. The Congress objected, insisting that providing printed information was education, and that the

Army should not be in control of the education of soldiers.

The Congress passed the matter to a committee, and this issue was debated throughout the remainder of the war. Washington never received his printing press, but he did, however, persuade some of his wealthy officers to ask their friends to print a journal for the Army. Foner indicated there were many Tory newspapers and pamphlets being circulated to the public and to the colonial troops. These publications were full of propaganda and misinformation designed to demoralize and frighten Washington's troops. Washington's aim was to initially counter the disinformation and then build their morale. Washington's officers provided the paper necessary to print the journals. These journals provided accurate information, countered misinformation and doubts, and improved the morale of the soldiers.

Washington was also credited with an early episode of literacy education while encamped at Valley Forge in 1778. He directed his chaplain to provide education in the form of reading, writing, and arithmetic instruction for those in his command who desired to improve themselves during their leisure (off-duty) time. A hospital building, cleared of patients, was used as the camp school. Lessons continued daily during the final weeks of the encampment.

30. H. F. Clark and H. S. Sloan, Classrooms in the Military: An Account of Education in the Armed Forces of the United States, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), 15 and Display of Revolutionary War Training at the Museum of American History, Washington, D.C. In 1776, the first military training manual appeared in this country. Entitled Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States and written by Major Friedreich Von Steubin, it was significant because this was the first attempt by the United States military at standard training and education. Von Steubin not only authored the manual, but actually instructed Washington's Army from the manual at Valley Forge in 1778.

31. Heinl, 26-27.

32. Edward L. Beach, The United States Navy: 200 Years, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1986), xvi and 177-178. The study of Naval battles during this period accounted for only a few hours, while an immense majority of the remaining time had been devoted to training.

33. Logan, 269, Beach, 177-178, Alexander S. Dallas, Commodore, Records of U.S.S Constellation, June, 1836, Record Group 149, National Archives, Washington, D.C., S. De Christofar, "The Navy Lyceum", U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Volume 77, number 8, August 1951, 869-873, and Hattendorf, Simpson, and Wadleigh, 16. The Navy used the schoolmaster system beginning in 1813 to provide general education to many enlisted men. A few more conscientious schoolmasters went beyond the navigation, astronomy, and mathematics normally taught and began to teach in subjects that were more general in nature, such as English and literature. In addition to responsibility for formal courses, the schoolmaster also were in charge of the ships' library. This policy was still evident in the 1836 record of the U.S.S Constellation that indicated that "the ship's library will be placed under the particular charge of the school-master."

Another development in the provision of general education was the Navy Lyceum. The first Naval Lyceum was established in 1833 in New York and organized under the American Lyceum as a literary and scientific association. Several Naval Lyceums were established at the different Navy Yards as a "means to promote discussion on naval issues." The New York Naval Lyceum published the first naval professional journal, The Navy Magazine, from January 1836 until November 1837. The Navy Lyceums survived until the outbreak of the Civil War.

34. Beach, 179.

35. Beach, 179-180.

36. J. W. Porter, "The Corps' Oldest Post", Marine Corps Gazette, November 1950, 10.

37. Interview and oral history from Mr. Richard Long, Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C., February 1990 and Beach, 177-178.

38. Beach, 177.

39. Simmons, 38.

40. Fred A. Ruoff, "The Story of a Dream", Marine Corps Gazette, February 1920, 15-23.

41. Official Letter, Archibald Henderson, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, December 13, 1839.

42. Paul E. Bierley, John Philip Sousa, American Phenomenon, (Columbus: Integrity Press, 1973,), 33-34, and Robert Hugh Williams, The Old Corps: A Portrait of the U.S. Marine Corps Between the Wars, (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1982), 93. Williams indicates that the Marine Corps Band has been a part of the Marine Barracks Washington since the establishment of the post in 1801. The legislation creating the Marine Corps in 1788 required 32 drummers and fifers, but not a band. The band was the initiative of Lieutenant Commandant Burrows in 1800 when he acquired instruments and musicians. The first public concert of the Marine Corps Band was held on July 4, 1800 in Philadelphia. In 1801 the band played for President Adams at a reception, and later at the inauguration of Thomas Jefferson. From these requested performances the "President's Own" nickname was born. The point of this information is to emphasize the importance of the Marine Corps band and the need to maintain a band.

43. Official Letter, Archibald Henderson, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, October 22, 1849.

44. C. D. Chambers, "The Grand Old Man (BGen. Archibald Henderson)", News Release, Release Number 004-87, 1987, United States Marine Corps, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., 4.

45. Official Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States, Advising the President and Heads of Department in Relation to the Official Duties, Volume IV, (Washington: Robert Farnham Publishers, 1852), 89-90.

46. Heinl, 63.

47. John A. Lejeune, The Reminiscence of a Marine, (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, Inc., 1930), 460.

48. Heinl, 63.

49. Archibald Henderson, Official letter, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., November 12, 1857, Muster Rolls 1857, Marine Barracks, Washington D.C., Record Group 109, National Archives, and Archibald Henderson, Official letter, Headquarters of the Marine Corps,

Washington, D. C., November 18, 1923. Muster rolls indicate Lieutenant Green was assigned to the Marine Barracks and went to West Point in the summer of 1857. In an earlier letter Henderson attempted to provide more responsibility to Marines aboard ships by establishing Marine gunners. He also wanted Marine Corps Artillery with their own field pieces. His initiative with Lieutenant Green brought still another of his dreams to fruition.

50. Heinl, 63.

51. Smith, interview, 25 June, 1991, Historical Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

52. William W. Burrows, Official letter Headquarters Marine Corps, 16 July, 1799, to John Rutledge, Jr. Senator from Charleston, S.C., Marine Corps Historical Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C. Commandant Burrows personally thanked Senator Rutledge for his commission and state that he was "indebted" to Rutledge. President John Adams appointed Burrows on 12 July 1978.

53. Smith, ibid.

54. Lejeune, 460, McClellan, 273-286, Reeves, 11, Clark, 15, Logan, 266, 270-285, 307, 321 and Bernard, 825, 838,and 897. The need and size of a military in America was debated following the Revolutionary War. Implicit in the debate was training and education requirements for soldiers, sailors, and officers. George Washington, a firm believer in military education, advocated the establishment of an academy for the education of officers in the Army. The leaders and officers in the Army and Navy, as well as their numerous supporters, wanted the government to build and allocate funds for academies that would provide education for officers of the United States military. In 1802, the United States Military Academy was established at West Point, New York. Soon states began to establish military colleges and institutions to provide more able leaders for their state militia. Many "academies" were also established by private efforts, with curricula based on military principles or embodying military features.

Establishing a Naval Academy was a continuing debate since the days of John Paul Jones, a Revolutionary War naval hero, to the era of Alfred Thayer Mahan, a noted early nineteenth century naval strategist. The leaders, officers, and supporters of the Navy also wanted a Naval Military

Academy that would ensure that Naval ships were manned with properly prepared and educated officers. In 1800, the Secretary of War James McHenry called for "the School of the Navy", but this effort was not supported by the Congress. In 1814, the Secretary of the Navy recommended the establishment of a "Naval Academy," but it was not until 1845 the United States Naval Academy was established at Annapolis, Maryland. Although it opened with only ten cadets in 1845, its cadet population slowly grew and numbered more than one hundred cadets per year by 1885. Congress wanted to use the Military Academy at West Point as a "twin institution." The "twin institution" concept was resisted by the Army, leaving the Navy without an academy. The Navy, however, maintained schools at Boston, New York, and Norfolk, where the major Navy Yards were located. These schools were very small with only six, fifteen, and thirty-one students enrolled at each school, respectively. The schools provided only very basic training for Naval officers. The school was to be comprised of a director, professors of mathematics, geography, natural philosophy, and architecture, and a design and drawing-master. This effort at Annapolis was the Navy's first substantive divergence from an emphasis on training afloat rather than ashore.

The Pennsylvania Military College, established in 1821, and the Virginia Military Institute, established in 1829, are examples of state institutions. Aldan Partridge founded the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy at Norwich, Vermont, in 1820. This particular institution was a college preparatory finishing school that endeavored to prepare gentlemen for college. Partridge was the Superintendent at West Point from 1814 to 1819. He was removed due to a controversy surrounding the cutting and selling of timber at West Point. Partridge believed that the War Department was not providing the appropriate funds for the operation of West Point. Partridge sold the timber to cover costs for operating West Point. He established the school at Norwich along the lines of West Point.

55. Pedro A. Del Valle, Semper Fidelis, (Hawthorne: Christian Book Club of America, 1976), 15. This is the only account or record of this particular Marine School that provided training to incorporate the U.S. Naval Academy graduates into the Marine Corps after the 1882 legislation.

56. Heinl, 63.

57. Ibid, 108.

58. Ibid, 108-109.

59. Form 30-D, Record Group 109, National Achieves, Washington, D.C. There are many examples of recording instruction, practice, drill, and training Marine Corps-wide from 1870 to 1895. There was indication of the Colonel Commandant requiring certain training by directives signed in 1871. The Marine Corps utilized the Army's "Form 30-(d)" for the purpose of recording musketry practice until 1885 when the Marine Corps developed their own form. A sharp-shooter form was developed in 1892 and a similar form for use aboard ships in 1895.

60. "The Mariners", Manchester Union, March 18, 1875, 10.

61. Josephus Daniels, The Wilson Era: Years of Peace 1910-1917, (Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1944), 265, "Major General Charles Heywood United States Marine Corps", U.S. Marine Corps Historical Center, Navy Yard Washington, Washington, D.C., November, 1949, 67, and Reeves, 19-22.

62. Reeves, 19-22.

63. Timothy K. Nenninger, The Leavenworth Schools and the Old Army, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1978), 3, 5, 9, and 17, Sol Cohen, "The History of the History American Education, 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past", Harvard Educational Review, Volume 46, Number 5, 1976, 303, L. R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 384, J. C. Shelburne and K. J. Groves, Education in the Armed Forces, (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), 83, United States Statutes at Large, V, 259, Foner, 41, General Order Number 22, April 7, 1866, War Department Adjutant General Office, Washington, D.C., Bruce White, "ABC's for the American Enlisted Man: The Army Post System 1866-1898", History of Education Quarterly, Volume VIII, Number 4, 480-481,and 492, Revised Statutes of the United States 1873-1874, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 217, and Reeves, 315. Army leaders realized that in order to cope with the technological, organizational, and tactical change occurring in warfare, educated, well-trained, and professional officers were needed. To help meet this need

Army doctrine slowly became established and promulgated at Leavenworth between 1881 and the first World War. The reformers of formal military training and education within the Army, primarily Secretary of War Emory Upton, aware of general trends in United States university education, transferred modern instructional techniques to the Army's School of Application.

In a parallel circumstance, late nineteenth century, Americans who attended German universities for the purpose of acquiring the tools of scholarship bought home not only tools, but ideas. These ideas became the basis of higher education in America. The American Historical Association (AHA) was organized in 1884 by a group of young American scholars who had returned from historical training in Germany. The AHA propagated and gave new direction to American history or history in America. The idea of academic freedom was another idea that was introduced by those who studied in German universities. Shelburne and Groves indicate that the rise of graduate education, typified by the establishment of Johns Hopkins University in 1876, offered another interesting parallel in the history of American higher-education and military post-graduate education.

In 1838, the United States Statute at Large was the only legislation that provided for the education of Army enlisted men in other than military skills related training and education. This statute permitted the administrative council at each Army post to hire a chaplin "who would also act as school-master." The statute was interpreted by the post commanders as a "spiritual" educational requirement that was the responsibility of the chaplin to administer. The provision of basic schooling for Army enlisted men was the first Service level general education activity in United States military as stated in the statute. The post commanders were reluctant to become involved in the activities and as a result these were few posts with schools providing basic schooling.

During the Civil War independent agencies attempted to provide education and reading for the Union Army. Reading agents for the Army of the Cumberland provided 35,000 magazines by the end of 1863, and established a "loan library" system with over 250 libraries. By the end of the Civil War, few of the early schools for enlisted men from the 1838 law were still operational.

A major initiative after the Civil War was the creation of the Army Post School System. The War Department, in 1866, under General Order Number 22, permitted the education

of "such uneducated soldiers as may be in need of improvement" and the legitimate expenditures of post funds for this purpose. On May 2, 1866 Representative James A. Garfield of Ohio proposed that the requirement of Post Schools be attached to another proposal providing for the detail for ordering of Army officers to college. Garfield was supported by representative Robert C. Schenck, both of whom were Civil War generals. The final proposal was incorporated in the 1866 Army Reorganization Bill and became law. In July 1866 the actual legislation was very explicit with regard to general education: "Schools shall be established at all post, garrison and permanent camps where troops are stationed, in which the enlisted men may be instructed in common English branches of education and especially in the history of the United States; and Secretary of War may detail such officers and enlisted men as may be necessary to carry out this provision. It shall be the duty of the post or garrison commanders to set apart a suitable room or building for school and religious purpose." (This is a revision of the actual Post and Garrison Statutes from July 28, 1866.)

The General Order authorizing these post schools provided for "instruction in the common branches of education, especially in the history of the United States." General Order 22 also mandated that each Post Commander establish a school. The post school was conducted in the same manner as the public schools and regular hours were prescribed by the Post Commander. The chaplain was usually designated to supervise the post school, and the subjects taught were largely elective. Enrollment was not compulsory but once enrolled attendance was mandatory.

Either Army Post Commanders were unaware of the mandate or they ignored the War Department's General Order Number 22 because few posts had established schools. Later in 1866 the War Department authorized construction of chapels and reading rooms to comply with the requirement. Apparently the General Order and the legislation were not widely disseminated and enforced by the War Department for several years. In 1871 Brigadier General E.O.C. Ord sought to force attention to this noncompliance by requesting permission to establish post schools within his command. Still the War Department resisted full implementation. Chaplin George C. Mullins along with General N. H. Davis ensured the requirement for post schools was reiterated in General Order Number 24 of 1878.

This new General order stipulated that enlisted men could be detailed as teachers with additional duty pay of

thirty five cents per day. The order further stipulated voluntary attendance for enlisted soldiers and required regular inspections and reports of an officer detailed by the War Department. In 1880 this position was designated Officer in Charge of Education in the Army. This officer's job was to inspect the post schools within the Army, ensure compliance with General Order 24, and to indicate the War Department was serious about this general education activity. In spite of this action, there was a continued lack of appropriate funds, facilities, competent teachers, and enthusiasm throughout the Army.

64. Annual Report of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Secretary of the Navy for 1891, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1891), 3-5.

65. Jack Shulimson, "The Marine Corps School of Application," The Journal Of Military History, October, 1991, 472-473.

66. Marine Corps General Order Number 1, May 1, 1891, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C. Since the School of Application was the first of its kind, it was announced by the first Marine Corps General Order, another first of its kind.

67. William D. Parker, A Concise History of the United States Marine Corps 1775-1969, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1970, 49.

68. Anthony A. Frances, History of the Marine Corps Schools, (Unpublished study, 1945), 6-12.

69. Ibid.

70. Shulimson, 470.

71. Frances, 12.

72. Shulimson, 477.

73. Shulimson, 476-485 and Frances, 12.

74. "Major General Charles Heywood United States Marine Corps", and Heinl, 110 and A Brief History of Marine Corps Officer Procurement, Historical Branch, G-# Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1958, 2-7.

Subsequently, George F. Elliot, the first permanent Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, arranged to send Marines to both the Naval War College and after 1907, the Army's Command and General Staff College, further adding to the professionalization movement that began in the late nineteenth century.

75. "The Marine Corps", New York Sun, June 20, 1898, 20. The article described some of the training and discipline of Marines at the time. It pointed out the variety as well as specificity of training. It also illustrated that "every effort to self-betterment is encouraged" as a trait that was being nurtured within the Marine Corps, since Commandant Heywood began his initiatives and his "pride in self" philosophy.

CHAPTER III

CONDITIONS, MODELS, AND PHILOSOPHIES OF MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT: 1898-1919

The Marine Corps expended great effort to secure a unique mission from 1898 to 1919 through the advanced base defense. Expansion, modernization, and professionalism created conditions requiring additional training and education. The activities developed during this period paralleled the development of similar activities in the Army and Navy.

The general activities established at Quantico built upon the philosophies of influential individuals and models of general education from other Services. Pre- and post-World War I educational activities helped some in leadership positions within the Marine Corps to recognize the need for general education for Marines. General John A. Lejeune, in particular, following the example of Josephus Daniels and the model of the American Expeditionary Force University, envisioned a vocational school to provide Marines a means to better themselves. A very conscientious Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee took Lejeune's vision and transformed it into an institution.

GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE EXPANSION, MODERNIZATION, AND PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE MARINE CORPS: 1898-1919

The Marine Corps expended great effort from 1898 to 1919 to secure a unique mission, a mission that by so doing unique training and education requirements developed. This effort of securing a unique mission was motivated by a continuing expansion in size, modernization in equipment and tactics, and desire for professionalization of the Marine Corps. The evolving mission of the Marine Corps in relationship to changing needs for training and education tended to parallel the development of similar activities in the Army and Navy and established a basis for Marine Corps general education activities.

Marine Corps Expansion

The end of the 19th century found the United States observing the world beyond its continental borders and developing new interests in the international scene. European and Latin American nations were creating international rivalries accompanied by a considerable expansion in armaments. Navies were being developed with ever larger and more powerful warships by nations that had

not previously been naval powers. Many American leaders believed that the United States could not remain detached from these military and technological developments. The Navy was the first Service to become involved in this expansion and modernization.[1] The U.S. Navy was mandated to maintain open sea lines of communications and trade. This directly influenced the Marine Corps because its mission was bound to the Navy's requirements. The Spanish-American War, World War I, and numerous other Naval actions throughout the world indicated that the Navy, supported by Marines, had the capacity to maintain its open sea mandate. The size of the Marine Corps surged from 2,149 before the Spanish-American War to a World War I peak of 79,024 and a post War strength of more than 28,000 in 1919.

The end of the nineteenth century found the Navy becoming a professional military Service with a majority of officers and enlisted men career-oriented, native-American, and well disciplined. By this time the Marines assigned to ships were no longer required as disciplinarians or a ready force to quell rebellious crews.[2] Their usefulness was also being underrated by professional Naval officers.[3] The continuing expansion of the Marine Corps was dependent, in part, upon its changing mission. Changes in size created new training and education requirements. The Marine Corps'

mission evolved from service aboard Naval vessels to an expeditionary advanced base force and a parallel training and education requirement established a basis for general education activities.

The Advanced Base Force Concept Emerges: A New Mission

Marine Corps leaders realized that responsibility for an advanced base force was a means to sustain the Corps' permanent status. The responsibility provided a valid reason for the Corps' continued existence as well as replaced the argument for assigning Marines as ships' guards. In its new role as a guardian of overseas Naval bases, the Marine Corps enjoyed the support of Navy leadership. Supporting the Marines was a small price to pay for excluding the Army from Navy spheres of influence and activity. With the Navy's support the Marine Corps would have an opportunity to develop its own unique mission as an advanced base force but Marine leaders also realized that significant training and education requirements would result with any new mission adaptation.

The advanced base force concept was developed from the events at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba during the Spanish-American War and subsequent training exercises. The concept also

provided a defense against Naval officers' criticism of the Marine Corps' lack of a unique mission. Articles appeared in professional journals describing the requirements of men and equipment to defend an advanced Naval base. Based upon Major Dion Williams' recommendation, the General Board increased the base defense force regiment requirement to 1300 Marines divided into three battalions. By 1914 the battalions included coast defense artillery, infantry, search light, engineers, signal and field artillery units with the preponderance of strength in the artillery and infantry units.[4]

New training and education requirements for specific missions under the advanced base force concept changed the daily life of the average Marine, especially the officers. Previous criticism of Marine Corps officers as lazy with little or nothing to do was now challenged. One officer recorded:

> A new scheme of things was underway in the Marine Corps. A regiment had been designated as an advanced base force. It was being trained to occupy a base in advance of the arrival of the fleet. I found that the easy drop in Philadelphia were over. With drills and 4 hours a day schooling, we didn't get out of the yard until 4:30 in the afternoon. Then we had to study at night.[5]

New emphasis on training markedly improved the efficiency of drill, discipline, marksmanship, and sobriety of Marines during the early twentieth century.[6]

In 1914, the Marine Corps fielded for the first time the First Advanced Base Brigade, consisting of two advanced base force regiments. In order to refute criticism the brigade conducted advanced base force exercises on the Island of Calebra in the Caribbean under the Command of Colonel George Barnett. The exercise scenario included a strategic requirement to defend a threatened Naval installation. The Marine Brigade landed unopposed, established itself without difficulty, and repelled other units in attempting to dislodge the defenders. The military umpires ruled that the Marines successfully defended the advanced base from a mock attack by opposing forces. The General Board recommended to the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, that yearly exercises be held to continuously develop the advanced base force concept.[7] Increased training began to yield successes for the new mission.

The development of the advanced base defense concept was preempted in 1917 by World War I and the subsequent attachment of the Marines to the American Expeditionary Force in France under the U.S. Army. The Marine Corps had

established the framework for a unique mission and began to adapt training and education to the new mission requirements.

Manipulation of Publicity and Popularity: 1898-1919

To fuel the engine of expansion many more new recruits were needed. These recruits were then trained and educated into the need of the evolving mission. The Marine Corps quickly learned after the Spanish-American War how to ensure a continuous flow of recruits.

The Marine Corps gained much public recognition for the first successful land engagement in the Spanish-American War. This action included a Marine battalion, formed by the Secretary of the Navy and the Commandant of the Marine Corps as an afterthought, comprised of 633 enlisted Marines and 24 officers. The battalion of Marines was loaded on a Navy transport on June 7, 1898 enroute to take and hold Guantanamo Bay as a coaling station for the Navy.[8] On June 11, the Marines landed, achieved all objectives and accomplished all assigned combat missions. They performed well for their first ground action of the War and received full press coverage. Ironically, this was not a major engagement and the Marines received a disproportionate

amount of press coverage.[9] Other performances of Marine units in the China Relief Expedition and Legation defense and in the Philippines Insurrection reported by the press further increased the popularity of the Corps both with the public and with the Congress.[10]

The Marine Corps took full advantage of its public popularity as well as popularity among law makers and was able to expand in size under the reorganization of the Navy and Marine Corps in 1899. The authorized strength of the Marine Corps was raised to 201 officers and 6,062 enlisted Marines, an increase of 125 officers and 3462 enlisted Marines form the previous peacetime total. By 1908 the authorized strength of the Marine Corps had increased to 332 officers and 9,521 enlisted Marines.[11] These modest increases were significant to the nation's smallest Service. This popularity and ability to manipulate it has continued within the Marine Corps and is significant because it offered a wider range of education levels among recruits from which to choose.[12]

Marine Corps Modernization

Modernization in the Marine Corps began in late 1890's. The changes in technology drove the Navy and the Marine

Corps during this period creating obvious training needs and educational requirements in the maintenance and operation of equipment. The organizational expansion demanded a corresponding expansion in training requirements in the tactics, techniques, and procedures to integrate the modern equipment and larger force.

An example of the relationship to training and education was the introduction of a radically new weapon, the Naval rifle. The Naval rifle, an improved model of the Army's Springfield .45-70 breechloader, replaced the standard Marine rifle, and required modification of all related training.[13] Drill, marksmanship, and to some extent tactics were all impacted because of the changes in this weapon. The Colt-Browning machine-gun was also introduced and proved to be the most modern crew-served weapon in the Marine Corps.[14] Again, marksmanship and integrated tactics were effected by the new weapon.

Marine Corps' modernization included the adaptation of other weapons, land vehicles, and the airplane. Aircraft integration gave rise to new Marine missions and techniques before and during World War I. From inception the Marine Corps conceived the airplane as an integral weapon, not a separate arm. This becomes more evident as the concept of aircraft as a weapon further developed. The increase in

aviation technology greatly impacted operational training needs and education requirements.[15]

Training and Education and Marine Corps Professionalization

A review of the evolving professionalization of the Marine Corps during the period from 1898 to 1919 illustrates continuing development of training and education to ensure the most professional officers and Marines. The Marine Corps operated for more than a century as a small, yet expanding, military organization. Unlike the larger Services, the Marine Corps had no means to create their own academy, formal training and education, and general education activities. There were, however, several unrelated short-lived attempts to professionalize its order. Only after the Spanish-American War did the move toward professionalism take hold and become characteristic of the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps began to emulate other Services regarding professional military education in the early part of the twentieth century. These efforts included formal school programs, professional organizations, and participation with non-military organization. Implicit in the professionalism movement was the desire to better

educate officers and non-commissioned officers for more effective and efficient mission execution.

All training and education aspects on-going within the Navy and Marine Corps, including general education, accelerated at the turn of the twentieth century. The Navy initiated a school of instruction in 1901 for Petty Officers, primarily for leadership training. This most progressive innovation gained attention among the Services.[16] This 25-man school was the Navy's first attempt to provide professional military education type training for enlisted men. The Navy school announcement appeared in the Army and Navy Journal that was thoroughly read by Marine Corps leaders in Washington.[17]

By the end of 1913 all Navy ships and stations had established general education schools. Unlike the schoolmaster program, Marines now had permission to participate in these educational opportunities.[18] This program was an initiative of the Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and will be discussed in great detail later in this chapter.

Formal Professional School Programs

The Marine Corps' School of Application, which formally trained newly-commissioned officers, began operation again in September 1899 at the Marine Barracks in Annapolis, Maryland. The school had been closed during the Spanish-American War.[19] Subsequently, Major General Commandant Elliott arranged to send Marines to both the Naval War College and the Army Command and General Staff College, the latter established in 1907. This significant action furthered the effort of the professionalism movement within the Marine Corps.[20] Marine Corps officers could now attend the other Services' professional colleges and they became aware of ideas, tactics, techniques, and procedures applicable to the Marine Corps. In 1909, some Marine units established formal programs for non-commissioned officer instruction.[21] These programs brought Marine Corps enlisted men into a standardized and formal structure of leadership and professional training and education.

In 1910, the Marine Corps Advanced Base School at New London, Connecticut was established. The school's mission was to train officers and enlisted Marines in handling, installation, and use of advanced base material; to investigate what types of gun platforms, mines, torpedoes,

defense equipment and other equipment might be best suited for advance base defense; and to instruct military and naval subjects pertaining to the selection, occupation, attack and defense of advanced bases and expeditionary service.[22]

By 1916 the Marine Corps had institutionalized a standard fourteen week training program for recruits.[23] As the Marine Corps was wrestling with its mission and size it began to professionalize its ranks.

Involvement in formal professional school programs, professional organizations, and non-military organizations indicated the strides the Marine Corps made in training and education, particularly in military skills training and professional military education.

Professional Organizations and Non-Military Organizations

In 1911 many within the Marine Corps officer corps wanted reform, professionalism, and assurance of the advanced base force mission. This quiet revolt of Marine Corps officers was the result of a lack of continuity of the training involved in the advance base defense and precipitated the creation of the Marine Corps Association. The Association pledged to oppose efforts to restrict Marine

missions and to educate officers on the Marine Corps' naval value to include the advance base force concept.[24]

In 1912, within one year of creation of the Marine Corps Association, Marine Corps Gazette, its periodical, began publication.[25] The Gazette provided Marine Corps officers a forum for addressing ideas and became a primary vehicle for discussing Marine Corps policy, training and education, tactics, and equipment. Marine Corps War College advocates promoted the topic in the pages of the Marine Corps Gazette.[26]

The Y.M.C.A. provided representatives at all Marine Corps units starting in 1912, as part of a national effort.[27] The Marine Corps eagerly participated in the program and provided spaces and liaison personnel to assist the representatives. In the same year the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, began to point out in periodicals its potential as a great national university.[28]

JOSEPHUS DANIELS AND THE NAVY UNIVERSITY

Josephus Daniels' philosophy of education, his efforts in general education in the Navy, and his personal relationship with John A. Lejeune, Smedley D. Butler, and William C. Harllee contributed to the Marine Corps' emerging

general education philosophy as well as its first significant general education effort. Daniels supported the Marine Corps' general education activity and its leaders throughout his tenure in the Navy Department as well as activities in other ventures after the Wilson administration further promoting his general education philosophy.[29]

Josephus Daniels was the Secretary of the Navy during the Wilson Administration from 1913 to 1921. Daniels' philosophy of education developed throughout his life and his position in the Wilson Administration provided an opportunity to display this philosophy to others. He was born on May 18, 1862 in Washington, North Carolina, but grew up in nearby Wilson.[30] Because there was no real public school in Wilson until graded public school was established throughout North Carolina in 1883, Daniels attended the Wilson Collegiate Institute. In the summer he attended the "free school" that was held in an abandoned carriage factory.[31] The town of Wilson boasted of good schools.[32] Wilson's citizens were among the first in North Carolina to realize public education "at the expense of all taxpayers is the right of every child."[33] This was an idea that Daniels carried with him throughout his life. A teacher, Edward Morse Nadal, known as "cousin Ed" to his students, was noted

as being very influential in shaping Daniels' thoughts on education.[34]

After attending college Daniels became a newspaper editor and used his position to promote the idea of "universal public education" in North Carolina.[35] He was politically motivated and believed the kinds of improvements for the society, such as universal public education, were the things that helped the Democratic Party gain power in North Carolina politics.[36] His involvement in politics helped him become involved in the Woodrow Wilson campaign in 1912 and subsequently influenced his appointment to the Wilson cabinet as Secretary of the Navy.[37]

While Secretary of the Navy, Daniels not only influenced the future of the Marine Corps general education activities, but directly orchestrated more liberal type general education programs within the Navy. While visiting U.S. Naval Training Station at Newport, R.I. in 1913 Daniels observed "sailors and Marines had spare time that was not employed," "many of them were lacking in elementary education," and that changes were needed.[38] Daniels was convinced by his visits to other similar stations that every sailor and Marine "should not only have a chance to learn the fundamentals aboard ships, but also learn a trade".[39] He visited a Marine barracks in Panama and saw an officer,

Smedley Butler, teaching his men Spanish.[40] He was moved by the experience and became determined to strengthen the Navy as an educational institution.[41]

After consultation with several Navy and Marine Corps officers who shared his desire to give sailors and Marines a better chance, he was then committed to strengthen the Navy as an educational institution, "with schools on every ship."[42] When challenged Daniels answered:

> If you don't believe a man can coal a ship and shoot better or do any job better if educated, you ought to go to Massachusetts and tear down the statue of Horace Mann. When you have done that comeback and talk to me. No American has the right to call himself that proud name who does not seek to educate and give large opportunity to every youth in the land.[43]

To make a point he recalled a speech that Charles Sumner made before Congress in 1866 that included a letter from General Lew Wallace that advocated a resolution that at every Army post and garrison the Officers should teach the men the rudiments of education.[44] In 1913 he wanted the Navy and Marine Corps to adopt what Sumner and Wallace had proposed immediately after the Civil War. He felt that he had the support of the President in his decision since he was an educator by profession.[45]

Daniels wanted to establish education and training opportunities that were beneficial to sailors and Marines

and would consume some of their idle time. Daniels then issued Secretary of the Navy General Order 53 announcing his program and later General Order 63 in 1913 that put into effect an educational and vocational training system for the benefit of the enlisted men of the Navy, both ashore and afloat. The system's purpose was to provide every recruit a line of training he wished to pursue with a regular course of instruction and give regular training and instruction along the line of work that he has selected. Self improvement was also a purpose of the program.[46]

The general orders established schools on every ship and station for enlisted sailors and Marines, made attendance compulsory, and required young officers to instruct the teaching.[47] It was to be the foundation for opportunities for an enlisted man who demonstrated the ability to be advanced from seaman to admiral. The program provided opportunity for a seaman to acquire an education, an opportunity with continued education to attend the Naval Academy, and acquire a commission as an officer in the Navy.[48] This Navy University afloat was, in effect, a merit system. Any seaman could receive basic education or, if qualified, secondary education, and by performing well in regular duties and in the educational requirements of this program could request consideration for an appointment to

the Naval Academy. Daniels secured authorization to appoint 100 enlisted men to Annapolis each year.[49] Other merits included promotion after completion of educational requirements.[50]

The Navy had transitioned in the mid-to-late 1800's from all sea-board training to mostly shore-based training. Daniels' program would return to training aboard ships, the original method of Navy training and education. A part of his program proposed to train non-academy college students on board battleships for a few weeks each summer. This program would motivate those in the Navy toward educational opportunities and recruit the qualified students studying each summer.[51] Daniels received much acclaim for his program and proposals.[52]

Secretary Daniels had schools in operation by January 1, 1914. This schooling was for all men not grounded in the common-school subjects such as reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, geography, and history. These students were required to take instruction until they had reached a satisfactory standard. Time was scheduled daily for these schooling functions.[53] The only men enlisting in the Navy that Secretary Daniels' education policy would not help, perhaps, were those who joined to avoid school.[54] He also proposed "welfare secretaries" similar to the secretaries of

the Y.M.C.A. aboard all ships and stations to look out for the morale of the sailors and Marines on the ships.[55]

A young Naval officer quizzed Daniels on the appropriateness of young officers being "school teachers." Daniels replied: "maybe you didn't want to become a school teacher, but since the American people have made a school teacher your Commander in Chief, you ought to regard it as an honor."[56] Daniels was of course referring to President Wilson. Daniels also believed that the schools stimulated ambition. Several young sailors and Marines obtained appointments to the Naval Academy while others left the service with qualifications for better positions and jobs in civilian life.[57] This was the real theme of Daniels' ideas: the Service should make the young boys into men, train them in a trade, educate them, and return a good citizen to the public when their enlistment was over.

The educational program established by Daniels received much resistance from the senior officer corps within the Navy. Daniels' foresight challenged an increasingly technical Navy and a "revolution" in training and education was required to change the situation.[58] He envisioned an education program for the Navy, the Marine Corps, and all of those within the Department of the Navy. The program provided a disciplinary advantage by using some of the free-

time of the men for training that would let them leave the Navy with knowledge and skills. Daniels also believed this opportunity for training and education would attract better recruits that were needed to accommodate the more technical equipment and associated training and education to operate that equipment.[59] Technological reasons, such as the Sperry Corporation electrifying the Navy's ships, made Secretary Daniels sure that "tying knots was no longer enough for a sailor to learn."[60]

The response to the education activity was mixed within the Navy. The officers were against it and the older enlisted men did not appreciate it; however, the younger enlisted men were very enthusiastic about the opportunity to go to school aboard ships.[61] Senior officers believed Daniels had it in for officers and was trying to remedy favors for enlisted personnel with his program. Daniels' education program was considered a revolutionary procedure, for both the Navy and its men.[62]

Once he established his educational program, Daniels wrote many articles to promote his program and to attract better quality recruits to the Navy. In a 1913 article in Popular Mechanics he wrote:

> My ambition as Secretary of the Navy is to make the Navy a great University, with college extension, high school extension, and primary

> extension all on board ship. Every ship should be a school, and every officer a school master. In this way we can give the young man his rightful chance to better his position, and at the same time benefit the Navy by increasing the knowledge and usefulness of its personnel.[63]

Daniels believed that many young men who had previously enlisted in the Navy had not had good educational opportunities.

In his 1913 article for The Independent Weekly Magazine Daniels went on to describe why this education program was needed. He was concerned over a visit to the USS Wyoming where he learned many of the boys and men had been denied the "advantage of an education and resolved that the advantage denied in private life should be made up to them during their enlistment in the Navy."[64] Daniels was also concerned with the fulfilling the Navy's pre-enlistment promise to recruits as opportunities to master a trade.

> The idea of the school ship, is not a new one, it is as old as our Navy. John Paul Jones, the father of our Navy, favored making every man-of-war of his day a "little academy," meaning a Naval school. He said " my plan for forming a proper corps of sea officers is by teaching them Naval tactics in a fleet of evolution. To lessen the expense as much as possible, I would compose the fleet of frigates instead of ships of the line, on board of each of which I would have a little academy, where the officers should be taught the principles of mathematics and mechanics when off duty. Matthew Fontaine Maury also favored the school aboard ships, and he said on the subject: "I would set apart one of the idle ships of the Navy for a school ship".[65]

As the schools began operating the Navy began to establish correspondence courses with the cooperation of nine universities, five correspondence schools and eighteen miscellaneous sources. All common school courses were offered by correspondence and an additional 56 subjects were also offered. The correspondence courses were discontinued during the War.[66]

Daniels' shocking first impression of the meager education of many enlisted Navy men led to his initiating the Navy University idea. His controversial General Orders 53 and 63 required the establishment of daily compulsory schooling in various elementary subjects on every ship and station by officers as instructors. His revolutionary educational program proved unpopular to most of those not participating and functioned with varying success until the first World War put an end to it. During his tenure as Secretary of the Navy Daniels met and corresponded with Lejeune and Harllee on Marine Corps and personal matters.[67] Daniels' philosophy of providing educational opportunities to improve the enlisted men in the Navy and Marine Corps for civilian life after their service was implicit in his action.

A PHILOSOPHY OF MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION EMERGES

Following the Spanish-American War and the expansion, modernization, and growing professionalism of the Marine Corps and the associated training and education requirements was an accompanying interest in general education for all Marines. Several individuals played an important part in the creation of the Marine Corps' first significant general education endeavors: the Commanding General of Quantico Marine Corps Base, Major General John A. Lejeune, and the Director of the activity Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee. Building upon Daniels' philosophy and his Navy university model, Lejeune employed his philosophy and experience with the American Expeditionary Force (AEF) University as the basis for the general education experiment for the Marine Corps at Quantico in 1920.[68]

John A. Lejeune: The Visionary for the Corps

Major General John A. Lejeune was the most influential Marine Corps officer in developing general education activities in the Marine Corps. General Lejeune, the commander of the Marine Expeditionary Force and the AEF's Second Division in Europe during the War, became very aware

of how education could provide for needs of individual Marines. During the occupation at the end of the War, Lejeune conducted technical schools as well as colleges with 2,000 students. He believed the best way to build up and maintain morale was to provide Marines an opportunity to get an education.

The American Expeditionary Force University: A Model for Lejeune and General Education

A short lived but significant experiment in general education in the Armed Forces of the United States was offered to servicemen serving in France in World War I, the American Expeditionary Force (AEF) University. The concept of the AEF University was a product of the Fosdick Commission, established during World War I to study means to provide for the well-being of American soldiers, sailors, and Marines in Europe. This commission asked volunteer organizations including the Y.M.C.A., the Red Cross, the Knights of Columbus, and the American Reading Society to deliver the educational services to the American troops. This effort had a three-tiered design for its operation. There was the basic education tier, high school completion

tier, and college completion tier.[69] Lejeune was in a position to observe the chronicle of the AEF University.

Early in 1918 General John Pershing, the commander of the AEF, and other military leaders foresaw the end of the war and the problem of demobilizing the 2,000,000 American soldiers, sailors, and Marines. Some members of Pershing's Staff believed that the men should keep drilling and training while others wanted a program to help ease the transition to civilian life to be established, and still others, particularly educators, wanted the men to be offered opportunities for education.[70] The latter ideas not only influenced the purpose of the AEF University but Lejeune as well.

In December 1918 the Stars and Stripes, an American newspaper published in France for the troops stationed in Europe, announced the opening of the "world's largest school enterprise" for the American soldiers awaiting orders back to the United States.[71] The enterprise called for the billeting officer at every Army camp to provide proper accommodations for the various schools being established. The courses to be offered within these various schools included agriculture, automobile manufacturing and salesmanship, business courses, chemistry, and physics to name a few. Forty seven thousand Army officers and enlisted

men identified with previous teaching experience were assigned as the instructors. Fifteen hundred cases of textbooks were provided at a discount from book publishers in America and shipped to the Army. The American Library Society working in conjunction with the Y.M.C.A. and the Army expected to receive a half million books for the library of the AEF University.[72] The administration, facilities, curricula, instructors, and learning and resource materials were programmed for the AEF University.

As the commencement of operations of the AEF University was being made ready, several efforts were completed to expand the concept to provide opportunity to more AEF soldiers, sailors, and Marines. These actions also influenced Lejeune's plans for similar activities for the Marine Corps. The few Army Post Schools operating in France at the end of the War were directed to be incorporated into every division to provide schools "where men may take work corresponding to high school courses and also vocational work."[73]

College courses offered were fully credited toward college degrees.[74] Correspondence courses for business methods courses were managed by W. H. Lough of the Business Training Corporation of New York.[75] Even a standing school at Grieves, France was in operation for rudimentary

subjects. Again the instructors were drawn from the ranks of the AEF and the intent was to make education available to soldiers in their off-duty time.

Post graduate work was offered to qualified men of the AEF in fourteen French Universities and several English and Scottish Universities.[76] A program of study in the French and English Universities was worked out cooperatively with the Education Department of the Y.M.C.A. and the American University Union. Furloughs were tendered to soldiers for graduate and undergraduate work at these French and English Universities. Students for the French Universities, however, had to know and understand French in order to attend. The students of the AEF University, however, could not receive furloughs to remain in France after their units re-deployed to the United States as the post-graduate students in the French and English Universities.[77]

Initially the educational program mapped out by the AEF General Head Quarters (GHQ) displayed high enrollment expectations--150,000 in post schools and 20,000-25,000 in the French, English, and AEF Universities.[78] Every member of the AEF was afforded an opportunity to take advantage of at least part of the educational program. Ten percent of the Third Army was enrolled in the Army schools in France as of April 1919.[79] The AEF University plan encompassed

remedial education through secondary, vocational, undergraduate, graduate, and correspondence programs. There were three phases of the educational program. First, the program provided basic education, vocational training, agriculture, and other subjects for every man in the AEF regardless of qualifications. Secondly, the program provided university courses for advance students in, or graduates of, American universities. Thirdly, the program provided correspondence courses for the benefit of isolated groups of soldiers and for men who want to take subjects not offered in their post schools.[80]

Lejeune Returns Home With a General Education Plan

Lejeune was assigned to duty as Commanding General of Marine Barracks, Quantico, Virginia, in October 1919, after having spent almost a year in post-war Europe evolving with the AEF University.[81] Both Lejeune and his executive officer, General Smedley Butler, were shocked to find the extremely low morale shared by officers and enlisted men alike. During the War, Quantico had been a thriving, exciting place where combat troops received their final training before going to the war in Europe.[82]

When Lejeune assumed command of the post a year after the armistice, the inevitable post-war reaction and peacetime let-down had set in.[83] No longer did the excitement of war prompt the troops to drill continuously. No longer did the sound of reveille acknowledge to the men that this was the day they would finally leave for combat. Now drill was a dull, tiring, and a pointless routine. Reveille now meant only another day of tedious boredom was beginning. Explaining his reaction to this situation Lejeune was convinced that the best thing to do was to build up and restore the morale of the officers and men. With this end in view, military formations, reviews, inspections and drills were reinstituted. A field officers school was established and to maintain morale for the enlisted Marines an extensive educational system that was to give them a chance to go to school was to be established. This school was not to be compulsory but voluntary. He knew that the men would only maintain an interest in drill for two or three hours a day leaving a lot of hours for idleness. He envisioned what a military organization could be when every person who came into the service was provided an opportunity to obtain an education.[84]

Lejeune believed that experience was an important part of any curriculum. With this thought, he believed the way

that a curriculum is designed may add immense value to professional development. He wrote that his experience in school and experiential events such as "staff rides" at the Army War College gave him greater mental power than before enabling him to proceed beyond any obstacle to be overcome.[85]

William C. Harllee: Implementing the Vision

Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee is the individual responsible for the actual development and execution of this general education activity. Harllee reported to Quantico and was immediately assigned to duty as Assistant Chief of Staff in charge of Vocational Training on December 20, 1919.[86] This renowned Marine schoolmaster, known for defying tradition, possessing tremendous drive and vitality, made a success of General Lejeune's school.[87]

William Curry Harllee was born in Florida on June 13, 1877. His education was varied yet extensive and his educational philosophy, similar to that of Daniels and Lejeune, developed throughout his life. From 1890 through 1894 he attended Oak Ridge Institute, North Carolina and then South Carolina Military Academy in 1897.[88] Two years later he was suspended from West Point for a "discrepancy in

discipline." Despite his actions as a student his philosophy contributed to general education in the Marine Corps.[89] Harllee displayed an opposition to tradition whether it manifested in the old time military caste system, book-solution combat tactics, or a hard and fast belief that an education would make a Marine a poor soldier.[90] He believed in innovation and teamwork.

Among the experiences that Harllee brought to Quantico was his work in the development of standardized Marine Corps rifle practice.[91] He was captain of the Marine Corps Rifle Team from 1908 through 1910, even though he was not a participating marksman.[92] The manner that he assumed this responsibility points to a definite pattern: study the situation, reflect on the situation, and act decisively.[93] He applied this pattern when he collected information on rifle practice from military and non-military rifle teams from all nations. He compiled and maintained this information in a voluminous notebook, and when he learned all he could about the subject, he evolved a new method of coaching his teams.[94] He would stress to the members of the team the concept of teamwork and made a point that every man was a resource and could teach another team member his "trade secrets" and personal knowledge.[95] Commandant Thomas Holcomb recalled that Harllee was the man who did most to

systematize the teaching of rifle practice for Marine teams.[96] Harllee created the first rifle score book utilized by the Marine Corps and for years it was known as the "Harllee System." As a result of his leadership in rifle practice, Harllee was made the First Vice President and a Life Director of the National Rifle Association in 1909.[97] This drive and follow through were personality traits that his reputation was built upon.

Harllee's service career indicates his impressive ability as a tactician in the field and his strong dislike for garrison duty. In the light of this fact it is surprising that he turned to his job as officer in charge of vocational training at Quantico with such zeal.[98] This paradoxical behavior had been revealed in similar situations previously in the Marine Corps' general education activities. Harllee's experience had shown that most adults had an adversity to classroom work and a reversion to childhood restraints, as well as a perceived unnecessary discipline that accompanied school. Many accounts of the schools at Quantico in 1919-1920 employ terms such as "universal appeal" and "wide-spread acceptance" but fail to recognize the fact that many Quantico Marines regarded the new school as nonsense.[99] When Harllee took his new job on December 20, 1919, the challenge was immediately thrust upon

him to make the Vocational Training School work.[100] The group of dissenters, the officers and men who thought that all a Marine should know was how to conduct a successful military campaign, made it miserable for the students. Some accounts of this opposition include the jeering lines of Marines as the "schoolboys" had to pass through as they went to class.[101]

SUMMARY

The Marine Corps expended great effort to secure a unique mission from 1898 to 1919, the advanced base defense. Marine Corps leaders realized that responsibility for an advanced base force was a means to sustain the Corps' permanent status, provided a valid reason for continued existence, and replace the argument for assigning Marines as ships' guards. Marine leaders also realized significant training and education requirements would result with any new mission adaptation. Expansion, modernization, and professionalism associated with a new mission requiring additional training and education.

Modernization in the Marine Corps began in late 1890's with obvious training needs and educational requirements in the maintenance and operation of new equipment such as the Naval rifle and Colt-Browning machine-gun. The

organizational expansion demanded a corresponding expansion in training requirements in the tactics, techniques, and procedures to integrate the modern equipment and larger force. The Marine Corps' modernization also included the adaptation of other weapons, land vehicles, and the airplane. Aircraft integration gave rise to new Marine missions and techniques before and during World War I.

The Marine Corps' School of Application began operation again in September 1899. Subsequently, Commandant Elliott arranged to send Marines to both the Naval War College and the Army Command and General Staff College, the latter established in 1907. This action furthered the effort of the Marine Corps professionalism movement with officers attending the other Services' professional colleges studying tactics, techniques, and procedures applicable to the Marine Corps. In 1909, some Marine units established formal programs for non-commissioned officer instruction with standardized leadership and professional training and education.

In 1910, the Marine Corps Advance Base School at New London, Connecticut was established with the mission to train officers and enlisted Marines in advanced base force and expeditionary service. By 1911 many within the Marine Corps officer corps wanted reform, professionalism, and

assurance of the advanced base force mission. This quiet revolt established the Marine Corps Association and its periodical, Marine Corps Gazette, providing Marine Corps officers a forum for addressing ideas, policy, training and education, tactics, and equipment.

By 1916 the Marine Corps institutionalized a standard fourteen week training program for recruits. Involvement in formal professional school programs, professional organizations, and non-military organizations indicated the strides the Marine Corps made in training and education, particularly in military skills training and professional military education. The activities developed during this period paralleled the development of similar activities in the Army and Navy and institutionalized general education within the Marine Corps was sure to follow.

The development of the advanced base defense concept was preempted in 1917 by World War I and the subsequent attachment of the Marines to the American Expeditionary Force in France under the U.S. Army. The Marine Corps had established the framework for a unique mission and began to adapt training and education to the new mission requirements.

Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy in the Wilson Administration, provided a model philosophy of

education that contributed to the Marine Corps' emerging general education philosophy as well as its first significant general education effort. In 1913 all Navy ships and stations had established general education schools unlike the earlier schoolmaster program. Marines now had permission to participate in this program, an initiative of Secretary Daniels. Daniels not only influenced the future of the Marine Corps general education activities, but directly orchestrated more liberal type general education programs within the Navy. He was convinced every sailor and Marine should not only learn the fundamentals aboard ships, but also learn a trade. He established schools on every ship and station for enlisted sailors and Marines, made attendance compulsory, and required young officers to instruct the teaching. The program provided opportunity for a seaman to acquire an education, an opportunity with continued education to attend the Naval Academy, and acquire a commission as an officer in the Navy. This Navy University afloat offered any seaman basic education or, if qualified, secondary education.

Another short lived experiment in general education also provided a model for the Marine Corps. The American Expeditionary Force (AEF) University offered servicemen serving in France after World War I basic education, high

school completion, and college completion. Lejeune was in a position to observe the development and administration of the AEF University. He was convinced that the best thing for Marines returning to Quantico from World War I was to build up and restore the morale with an extensive educational system and a chance to go to school. This school was not to be compulsory but voluntary. He envisioned what a military organization could be when every person who came into the service was provided an opportunity to obtain an education.

The Vocational Schools Detachment activities at Quantico built on the philosophies of influential individuals and models of general education for Service personnel. Pre- and post-War educational activities helped some in leadership positions within the Marine Corps recognize the need for general education for Marines. Lejeune, in particular, envisioned a vocational school to provide Marines a means to better themselves and Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee turned Lejeune's idea into an institution. The vocational schools of Quantico will be reviewed in more detail in the following chapter.

NOTES

1. The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume XII, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 150-151.

2. William E. Reichelt, From Ship to Shore: The Evolution of United States Marine Corps Roles and Missions, Unpublished Paper, 1977, 9.

3. Harry Allanson Ellsworth, One Hundred Eighty Landings of United States Marines 1800-1934, History and Museums Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1974.

4. Ibid, 5-11. The mobile unit was to be organized primarily as infantry and its mission was to protect the advanced base from ground attack by forces landed beyond the range of its artillery.

5. Frederick May Wise, A Marine Tells It To You, (New York: J. H. Sears and Company, Inc., 1929), 119.

6. Victor H. Krulak, First to Fight, (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1948), 10.

7. Major General Commandant, Third Endorsement of "Supplemental Report, Brigade Commander Advance Base Expedition, Calebra, January-February 1914," Record Group 432, Naval History Division, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

8. Edwin H. Simmons, The United States Marine Corps, (New York: Viking Press, 1976), 58-59, and Allan R. Millett, Semper Fidelis The History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.), 130-131.

9. Millett, 134, and Army and Navy Journal, January 23, 1909, 567.

10. Krulak, 10.

11. Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, 1975, 1140-1143.

12. "Marine Corps Vacancies," Army and Navy Journal, March 11, 1899, 647, and Untitled article Army and Nay Journal, May 13, 1899, 862; Major General Commandant Heywood, Official Letter to W. H. Moody, September 22, 1903, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Washington D.C., National Achieves, Record Group 127; Untitled article, Army and Navy Journal, January 11, 1902, 461; and "Popularity of the Marine Corps," Army and Navy Journal, March 21, 1908, 781; Bernard C. Nolty, United States Marine Corps Ranks and Grades, Historical Reference publication, Historical Division G-3, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington D.C., 1970, 20-25; and Robert A. Asprey, At Belleau Wood, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1965), 212-214. In 1899 new non-commissioned officer ranks were created for the Marine Corps to include Gunnery sergeant. This gave more incentive to remain in the Corps for a career. As the United States began sending the American Expeditionary Force to Europe in 1917 to join in the War, the Marine Corps had no problem filling its ranks as the authorization was increased by the Congress. Again, during World War I the Marine Corps received a disproportionate amount of press coverage. This was indirectly guaranteed by General John Pershing when he directed in 1917 that the Marine Corps individual units attached to the AEF could only be cited in newspapers as "Marines." Pershing also refused permission for news correspondents to name any other units because of security reasons. The first American offensive action was the battle at Belleau Wood and the Marine Brigade had a major part in the victory. The newspaper accounts, however, began citing the "Marines" as the victorious American Force. This provided the Marine Corps with a publicity break and name recognition for the remainder of the war and countless future recruits. Publicity and popularity played a significant role in the increase of both numbers and quality of officers and enlisted Marines during this period.

13. Robert Debs Heinl, Soldiers of the Sea: The United States Marine Corps 1775-1962, (Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1962), 108.

14. Ibid, 189. Between 1909 and 1914, the Marine Corps acquired 72 assorted motor vehicles. The Marine Corps was the first Service to adopt motor vehicles for tactical use with the modification of two armored cars. Again, new training in tactics,techniques, and procedures as well as maintenance and operation was required to adapt the new equipment into the operation of the Marine Corps.

15. Ibid, 190. The Colt .45 automatic pistol was also adopted by the Army. Also in Peter B. Mersky, U.S. Marine Corps Aviation: 1912 to the Present, (Baltimore: The Nautical and Aviation Publishing Company of America, 1983), 2; A Brief History of Marine Corps Aviation, Historical Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1960, 1-3; and Edward C. Johnson, Marine Corps Aviation: the Early Years 1912-1940, History and Museums Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1977, 3. Cunningham cited his reason for the short training period: "There being so few civilian flyers, the factory had to pay them a huge salary to teach us, and they were anxious to make it short and snappy ...I had only attempted to make two landings in rough weather, when one calm day they decided to risk the plane rather than to continue to pay instructors large salaries. I was asked if I was willing to try it alone and said I was..." The United States Marine Corps in the World War, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920), 71-79; A History of the U.S. Marine Corps 1775-1952, Historical Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1960, 4 and 7. The Marine Aeronautical Company was divided into two units: the First Marine Aviation Squadron and the First Marine Aeronautical Company. The First Aeronautical Company was transferred to Camp May, New Jersey and took over a former Naval Air Station before moving to the Azores in support of the AEF The Marine Aeronautical Company trained at a combination land and water station at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The personnel trained in maintenance as well as flying. Observation balloon training was also accomplished. On January 9, 1918 twelve officers and 133 enlisted Marines comprised the company and transferred to the Azores for the remainder of the War.

16. "Petty Officers' School," Army and Navy Journal, August 24, 1901, 1270.

17. Ibid and interview with Mr. Richard Long, United States Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington, D.C., February 1990.

18. Heinl, 160.

19. "The Marine Corps," Army and Navy Journal, August 19, 1899, 1209.

20. Jay Luvaas, "The Staff Ride," The Alumni Association Newsletter, U.S. Army War College, Number 25, Summer 1988, 12 and 314. There were also tangible intangibles that were evidence of the Marine Corps' modernization as well as professionalization. An example is the Scarlet and Gold ribbon of the Marine Corps Expeditionary Medal was adopted in 1919 to recognize Marine landings.

21. John A. Lejeune, The Reminiscences of a Marine, (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, Inc., 1930), 112.

22. Heinl, 160.

23. A Brief History of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island, South Carolina 1891-1962, Historical Branch G-3 Division, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1962, 1-5 and Hadys D. Hendrix, Oral History. Hendrix is a Marine combat veteran of World War I who indicated that he attended the 14 week boot camp at Parris Island in 1918.

24. Millett, 276-277. The reformers were led by officers such as George Barnett, Ben H. Fuller, Franklin J. Moses, and John A. Lejeune.

25. Donald F. Bittner, Curriculum Evolution: Marine Corps Command and Staff College 1920-1988, Unpublished paper, 1989, 1.

26. Millet, 277.

27. Memorandum from Acting Secretary of the Navy, September 26, 1912, National Archives, Record Group 109. There was a memorandum from the office of the Acting Secretary of the Navy to the Headquarters of the Marine Corps indicating the Y.M.C.A. representatives were to accompany Marines for "morale purposes".

28. Josephus Daniels "Training Our Bluejackets for Peace", The Independent Weekly Magazine, Volume 76, December 11, 1913, 492.

29. "The Federal Program of Education in Mexico," draft of a speech of a seminar, 15 July 1929, Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress. Daniels continued his attempts to provide education where needs as noted by

his efforts to establish an educational system i Mexico in from 1929-1936. He wrote many manuscripts ,speeches, and letters throughout his government service career that validated his concern for education. In this particular speech Daniels stated that education "put in the hands of youth a useful instrument for producing and not a talisman for opening the doors of bureaucratic careers."

30. Josephus Daniels, Tar Heel Editor, (Westport: Green-wood Pres, Publishers, 1939), 55-59.

31. Ibid, 71.

32. Josephus Daniels, Editor in Politics, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941), 402.

33. Tar Heel Editor, 57.

34. Ibid, vii.

35. Josephus Daniels, The Wilson Era: Years of Peace 1910-1917, (Westport: Greenwood Pres, Publishers, 1944), 256.

36. Ibid., 253.

37. Ibid, 256.

38. Ibid, 253.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. Carroll Kilpatric, Roosevelt and Daniels: A Friendship in Politics, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1952), xiv.

43. Ibid., 256.

44. Josephus Daniels, "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation," Saturday Evening Post, April 9, 1921, 80, General Order Number 22, April 7, 1866, War Department Adjutant General Office, Washington, D.C., Bruce White, "ABC's for the American Enlisted Man: The Army Post System

1866-1898", History of Education Quarterly, Volume VIII, Number 4, 480, Revised Statutes of the United States 1873-1874, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 217 (This is a revision of the actual Post and Garrison Statutes from July 28, 1966), and I. L. Reeves, Military Education in the United States, (Burlington: Free Press, 1914), 19. In his article for the Saturday Evening Post, then Secretary of the Navy Daniels related a story of General Lew Wallace (Ben Hur) had introduced legislation for the establishment of a Post School system in 1866 via Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Having reviewed the Congressional Record for that year, I was unable to validate Daniel's story and suggest White's account as the actual individuals involved. A major initiative after the Civil War was the creation of the Army Post School System. The War Department, in 1866, under General Order Number 22, permitted the education of "such uneducated soldiers as may be in need of improvement" and the legitimate expenditures of post funds for this purpose. On May 2, 1866 Representative James A. Garfield of Ohio proposed that the requirement of Post Schools be attached to another proposal providing for the detail for ordering of Army officers to college. Garfield was supported by representative Robert C. Schenck, both of whom were Civil War generals. The final proposal was incorporated in the 1866 Army Reorganization Bill and became law. In July 1866 the actual legislation was very explicit with regard to general education: "Schools shall be established at all post, garrison and permanent camps where troops are stationed, in which the enlisted men may be instructed in common English branches of education and especially in the history of the United States; and Secretary of War may detail such officers and enlisted men as may be necessary to carry out this provision. It shall be the duty of the post or garrison commanders to set apart a suitable room or building for school and religious purpose." The General Order authorizing these post schools provided for "instruction in the common branches of education, especially in the history of the United States." General Order 22 also mandated that each Post Commander establish a school. The post school was conducted in the same manner as the public schools and regular hours were prescribed by the Post Commander. The chaplain was usually designated to supervise the post school, and the subjects taught were largely elective. Enrollment was not compulsory but once enrolled attendance was mandatory.

45. Daniels, Josephus, General Order No. 53, Secretary of the Navy, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1913, 1. The actual wording of the General Order is: 1. The Navy Department wishes to put into effective operation an educational and vocational training system for the benefit of the enlisted men of the Navy, both ashore and afloat. As a beginning such schools have already been inaugurated at the training stations and steps are being taken toward their early establishment on board all naval vessels. in carrying out this system it is in the departments purpose that every recruit be given at the outset the line of training he wishes to pursue, and when he has made his choice, he shall be assigned to a regular course and be given regular training and instruction along the line of work that he has selected. 2. The needs of the men in the ground work necessary to their instruction and training along trade or vocational lines will, of course, vary, and as a first step this need will be determined in the case of each individual and such educational ground work as is necessary will be given him. 3. After the recruit has been under instruction and training for a sufficient period to determine in which direction he should, with better advantage to himself be further trained, the commanding officer of the ship or station shall cause him to be assigned to the kind of instruction and training that he has demonstrated an aptitude.

46. Daniels, The Wilson Era, 254 and Daniels, "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation", 24 and 80. Daniels attributes Horace Mann with the thought of education would help the dray driver and the stevedore and make them more efficient.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid.

49. Josephus Daniels, "The United States Navy," Munsey's Magazine, December, 1917, 585.

50. Daniels, General Order No. 53, 1.

51. Notes dated 1913 by Daniels found in Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress. The notes described the idea to invite qualified college students to study aboard battleships a few weeks in the summer each year.

52. Letter from Judge of Court of Appeals, Denver Colorado, January 10. 1914 and notes dated 1914 by Daniels found in Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress. The Judge of the Colorado Court of Appeals complimented Daniels on his educational program. The School Journal commended Daniel on his efforts for improving education. There were many other letters from textbook publishing company presidents, Wall Street lawyers, and newspaper editors, and newspaper articles.

53. Donald W. Mitchell, History of the American Modern Navy, (New York: Alfred A. Knoff Inc., 1946), 161. This policy also made the educational opportunities available to Marines.

54. Ibid. Daniels' policy helped enlistments in the Navy. Before the Navy had his education program the manning levels were about 5,000 short of requirements; however, after the educational activities began the enlistments were met and there were waiting lists.

55. Lejeune, John A., The Reminiscences of a Marine, (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, Inc., 1930), 460.

56. Daniels, The Wilson Era, 255.

57. Daniels, Jonathan, The End of Innocence, (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972), 129-130.

58. Ibid., 129.

59. Mitchell, Donald W., History of the Modern American Navy Form 1883 Through Pearl Harbor, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1946), 161.

60. Daniels, Josephus, "Making the Navy a Real Training School", Popular Mechanics, New York, N.Y., Vol 20, No.3, September, 1913, 324.

61. Ibid., 161.

62. Ibid., 160, 162.

63. Daniels, "Training Our Blue Jackets For Peace", Ibid.

64. Ibid, 491.

65. Ibid, 492.

66. Daniels, "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation", 83 and Cronon, E. David, The Cabinet Diaries of Josephus Daniels 1913-1921, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), 48.

67. Letters, notes, and telegrams found in Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress. Several letters from North Carolina Congressmen on Lejeune's behalf for his promotion and appointment as Commandant. Notes indicating Lejeune was on the Board of Control for the Marine Corps Association. Telegram from Secretary of the Navy to Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee congratulating Harllee and the Marine Corps Rifle team for winning the National Marksmanship Award.

68. Daniels, "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation", 80.

69. Fredrick M. Foster, "The Post and Division Schools of the AEF," School and Society, Volume X, Number 237, July 14, 1919, 50-52; G. Sherwood Eddy, "The American Soldiers in France", The Missionary Review of the World,, March 1918, 207-211. (Eddy spent three years in France with the Y.M.C.A. He indicated that opportunities other than educational ones were available through the Y.M.C.A.. There were also socializing and athletic activities.); and "Mobilizing the Y.M.C.A.", The Literary Digest, May 19, 1917, 1504. The Y.M.C.A. also sought to serve the needs of the men of AEF as one of their primary goals. John R. Mott, the General Secretary of the Y.M.C.A., believed the opportunity to serve men and boys in uniform was in the best interest of his associates. He encouraged the organizations supporting the AEF to "redouble their efforts to make available their organizations, leadership, and equipment in developing young men and boys in character, physical vitality, and mental efficiency" in view of the unusual demand "confronting the young manhood of our Nation." This was typical of the attitude and intention of the supporting organizations for the AEF during the War.

70. Rae Wahl Rohfeld, "Preparing World War I Soldiers for Peacetime: The Army University in France," Adult Education Quarterly, Summer 1989, 188.

71. "Free Education While You Wait for Orders Home", Stars and Stripes, December 6, 1918, 1.

72. Ibid; "Thousands Flock to Beaune for University Work", Stars and Stripes, March 7, 1919, 1; "Correspondence College Opens to A.E.F. Aspirants", Stars and Stripes, March 21, 1919, 2; "Army to Take Over Educational Work", Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 3; and untitled article Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 1, and 3. (A College of Correspondence was established by the Army Education Commission for the benefit of those men that can not attend the other educational opportunities of the AEF.

About 350 acres of land was made available for the purpose of instructing agriculture students in advance agricultural methods. The Farm school was part of the College of Agriculture, the AEF University at Beaune, France. Another area of study in the College of Agriculture was that of live stock. The vineyards in the occupied parts of Germany served as a base of study for those interested.)

A typical duty day at the AEF University at Beaune began at 7 o'clock with reveille, morning "chow", one hour of drill at 8 o'clock, and the remainder of the day devoted to studies. The planned courses at Beaune included agriculture, cadet. college courses, art, vocational courses, correspondence courses, and others.

The AEF University was administered by the Army Educational Commission that was mostly civilians, who wore U.S. uniforms with special insignia. The Y.M.C.A. provided the funding for the commission that advised the General Head Quarters on the educational programs, courses, texts, and syllabi development. The Commission was eventually militarized and operated by all Army personnel in mid-1919.

The Y.M.C.A. undertook the responsibility of establishing an educational system for the AEF at a period when the Army itself had to decide its entire personnel and resources to crushing Prussianism. The Y.M.C.A. was able to draw upon the American public for men and women who were not available for direct military service, who could assist the Army materially in building up a simple educational system, which would be practicable during hostilities and that could be expanded when fighting ceased. A demobilization education program could only be made possible if a substantial educational machine were built up during the period of active operation.

The AEF is now prepared to take over the control and responsibility from the Y.M.C.A. for the work of the Army Educational Commission. Although we realize that each

member of the educational staff originally enlisted in the Y.M.C.A., we are so eager that the aim of this great educational program be attained that we urge upon all the members of the staff to continue the work under the direct auspices of the Army and to render a great service to the American soldiers by supporting this work with the same loyalty and enthusiasm that they have given it while under the control of the Y.M.C.A..

There is going forward to most of the educational staff at this time a letter from G.H.Q. AEF, extending an invitation to work in the Army Educational Department. The Army Educational Commission comprised of advisors contemplated by the secretary of Yale university, Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes. Stokes' study of the educational possibilities in the Army in France recommended the members of the commission: as Chairman, Dr. John Erskine, of Columbia University; Dr. Frank E. Spaulding, superintendent of public schools, Cleveland, Ohio; and Dr. Kenyon L. Butterfield, president of Massachusetts Agricultural College made up the central body of advisers.

The complete list of courses offered included:

1. Agriculture
2. Cadet. (a preparation for the United States Military Academy at West Point)
3. College courses.
   a. English, b. Literature, c. Mathematics, d. Philosophy, e. French, f. German, g. Spanish, h. History, i. Economics, j. Civics, h. Sociology, l. Chemistry, m. Biology, n. Astronomy, o. Botany, p. Geology, Geography, and Physics.
4. Art School.
   a. Painting, b. Sculpture, c. Commercial Art, d. Decoration, e. Landscape design g. Architectural engineering, h. City planning and housing, i. Architectural heating, ventilating, lighting, sanitation, construction, and strength of materials.
5. Vocational courses.
6. Correspondence courses.
7. School of education (normal training)
8. Courses in journalism.
9. Music school.
10. Engineering.
11. Business school.
12. Pre-medical and dental school.
13. Law.
14. Theology.

73. "50,000 Soldiers Respond to A.E.F.'s Own School Call", Stars and Stripes, January 7, 1919, 1; Fredrick M. Foster, "The Post and Divisional Schools of the A.E.F.", 50-52; and "Soldiers Lecture to A.E.F. Students on Farming Topics", Stars and Stripes, 2. This policy re-established Post schools within the Army in France began January 1, 1919 with General Order Number 9 and later General Order Number 30. The Army Post School existed for the purpose of providing only compulsory education for illiterates. Before the Armistice there was little time or room for school among the combat troops and little attention given to education. After 11 November 1918, the Army placed a new emphasis on education to include a Post School at every post in France where there was at least 500 men. The commanders were frequently advised by a Y.M.C.A. man who been assigned either to a Post in particular or worked several posts with a particular Division. Some of the post school instruction in General Order Number 9 was very similar to the original legislation in the statutes from 1866 concerning Army post schools.

The Army made the post schools voluntary for officers and enlisted men, however, mandatory attendance at post schools was required for illiterate and non-english speaking soldiers. These post schools offered courses that were common school courses, modern languages, United States history, a course that featured modern nations, civics, and citizenship.

74. A.E.F. Vocational Training Plan is Outlined in General Order", Stars and Stripes, February 14, 1919, 3.

General Order 28, of February 11, 1919, further outlined the conditions under which soldiers could enroll in courses in universities in England and France. The General Order also amplified the Army educational program particularly in the vocational training area. It directed the establishment of training centers to "provide such vocational training as the material within the division or section makes possible." These training centers "are to provide instruction in more advanced subjects of general education than can be taught in the post schools--such subjects as algebra, trigonometry, mechanical drawing, salesmanship, economics, languages, and advanced history courses being specified." The General Order also provided information for those students at the AEF University at Nevers, France who wanted to remain to finish their courses.

75. "Free Education While You Wait for Orders Home", 1.and untitled article Stars and Stripes, December 6, 1918, 3. The AEF Applications for correspondence courses began in January of 1919. The business firms of J. Foster Hill and W. H. Lough supervised the general and business methods correspondence courses, respectively, in the AEF education efforts.

76. Untitled article Stars and Stripes, January 7, 1919, 1.

77. Stars and Stripes, December 6, 1918, 3. The AEF planned to open its own "University" for those soldiers that wanted to work on college courses at Nevers, France.

78. "150,000 in A.E.F. Enroll for Work in Post Schools," Stars and Stripes, March 7, 3.

79. "Tenth of Third Army is going to School", Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 2.

80. Ibid. The three phases were extensively discussed. First in importance, because they will be available to every man in the AEF regardless of his qualification, will be the post schools that, under the provisions of General Order 9 and G.H.Q., are being opened at all places where more than 500 men are stationed. Vocational training, agriculture and a variety of other subjects will be taught, the program being governed partially by local needs and conditions. Second, for advance students in, or graduates of, American universities are the university courses. A dozen or more French universities will receive upwards of 7,500 students, and English universities will care for 2,000. The courses offered will be open to both officers and men who can qualify,the requirements being, incidentally, stricter than those for American universities. for students who desire to take courses equivalent to American freshman and sophomore work, the AEF university of Beaune will be available for from 10,000 to 15,000 men. Third, for the benefit of isolated groups of soldiers and for men who want to take subjects not offered in their post schools, correspondence courses will be offered as soon as text books arrive and syllabi are prepared. Untitled articles Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 3 and April 5, 1919, 1. The former hospital was converted to the physical plant for this university and its fourteen colleges. The Army Educational Commission supervised the program of education at Beaune and throughout

better intelligence meant a better Army, and a better peace-time Army meant a better war-time Army. Colby's observation indicated that the Army, after long experimentation with general education was beginning to see value in these activities.

Courses offered in Army garrison schools included in the area of education training the subjects arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, English grammar, English literature, spelling, penmanship, general history, geography, civics, economics, and French. In the area of vocational training the subjects included auto driving, auto and truck repair, tractor driving, tractor repair, motorcycle repair, locomotive engine, storage battery specialist, musician, and dramatics. In the area of business training the subjects included bookkeeping, clerk, general, clerk, payroll, stenographer, typist, and salesmanship.

81. Robert E. Barde, The History of Marine Corps Competitive Marksmanship, Marksmanship Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1961., 138.

82. Lejeune, The Reminiscences of a Marine, 460, Willock, Roger, Biographical Sketch, "Major Smedley Darlington Butler, USMC, (Ret)", prepared for The American Council of Literary Society, Dictionary of American Biography, June 1956, 1, and Marine Barracks, Quantico, (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1930), 5. Smedley Darlington Butler was born at West Chester, Pennsylvania on July 30, 1881, into a distinguished Quaker family. Reared as a Hicksite Quaker, he was educated at the Friends' Graded High School at West Chester and later at the Haverford School near Philadelphia. Butler attempted to enlist into the Army in July 1898 but was rejected because he was under age. He did however convince a Marine Recruiter that he was eighteen and sought to secure a commission.

Commissioned a probationary Second Lieutenant, at the age of seventeen in 1898, Smedley D. Butler was to become one of the Marine Corps' most decorated officers, but his role in the beginning of sustained Marine Corps general education is also noteworthy. Butler received his initial training in 1898 in the Marine Corps School at the Headquarters in Washington, D.C. and was then sent to Cuba to participate in the Spanish-American War. Butler participated in most Marine Corps campaigns and operations form 1898 to 1920 to include the command of the Thirteenth

Regiment of Marines in France in 1918 during World War I. His was highly decorated to include being awarded the Medal of Honor twice.

83. Ibid., 460 and Rohfeld, 187. The Armistice did not automatically mean the immediate return of the AEF soldiers, sailors, and Marines. There were treaties to finalize, occupational responsibilities, etc. that had to be worked out prior to an orderly re-deployment of American forces back home. The length of waiting was unknown.

84. John A. Lejeune, Testimony, U.S. Congress Hearings Before Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on Estimates Submitted by the Secretary of the Navy 1920, Vol.2. (1821-3420), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1920, 1822 and Millett, Allan R., Semper Fidelis The History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980), 323, Official letter from the Secretary of the Navy to Brigadier General Smedley D. Butler, January 10, 1920, and Official letter from Brigadier General Smedley D. Butler to the Secretary of the Navy, January 13, 1920. Secretary of the Navy Daniels requested that General Butler write a letter providing information on what is being done with the vocational school and the plans for its future. Daniels also thought that the vocational school would help recruiting by promising and fulfilling educational needs of recruits. Butler responded with a detailed letter three days later explaining the plan of the school, the organization, and the plan for the future. Butler explained that the concept was "nothing more nor less than a huge military university" to be conducted as a "first class vocational and academic instructional institution without the slightest degree interfering with the military instruction necessary to produce the finest type soldier."

85. Jay Luvaas, "The Staff Ride", The Alumni Association Newsletter, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Number XXV, Summer, 1988, 12.

86. John Harllee, The Marine From Manatee: Tradition of Rifle Marksmanship, (Washington: National Rifle Association, 1984), 245.

87. Ibid., 20.

88. Ibid., 23

89. Ibid., 131.

90. Barde, 35-37.

91. Ibid., 27. In 1909, Harllee saw the need for a rifle range that could be used by Marines north of Norfolk, Virginia. He took charge of the construction of the range at Stumps Neck, Maryland. This was so successful that the Navy requested his services to construct the same model ranges at Great Lakes, Michigan and Caldwell, New Jersey.

92. William C. Harllee, U. S. Marine Corps Score Book and Rifleman's Instructor, (Philadelphia: International Printing Company, 1913), 11.

93. Barde, 27.

94. Ibid., 32.

95. Ibid., 28.

96. Ibid., 69.

97. Harllee, The Marine From Manatee, 240.

98. Ibid., 241.

99. Ibid., 242.

100. Ibid., 240.

101. Clyde H. Metcalf, A History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1939), 454-463.

CHAPTER IV

FROM THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS DETACHMENT TO THE MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE: 1919-1920

Daniels, Lejeune, Butler, and Harllee had several obstacles to overcome in establishing the Vocational Schools Detachment as an integral part of the Marine Corps training and education. This chapter describes this short-lived activity, first its curriculum, students, instructors, teaching, programs, and effectiveness of the programs and then the evolution of the Vocational Schools Detachment into the Marine Corps' only institutionalized general education activity to date: The Marine Corps Institute.

INITIATION OF THE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS DETACHMENT

The end of World War I found Quantico the most important post of the Marine Corps.[1] Quantico would soon incorporate Secretary Daniels' idea of a school that would benefit every man who came into the Marine Corps. Perhaps Daniels had failed because his all-encompassing goal led him to start too ambitiously. Lejeune also was a visionary, but his first efforts were on a smaller scale and more calculated.[2] When General Lejeune assumed command of the

Marine Corps Base at Quantico, Virginia a year after the armistice, he was convinced that the best thing to do was to build the morale of the officers and men. Military formations, reviews, inspections and drills were reinstituted and a field officers school was established. He envisioned a replica of the A.E.F. University model so every Marine was provided an opportunity to obtain an education.

Because of opportunities for general education Lejeune hoped Marines would enlist and remain in the Marine Corps to better themselves, the standards of the Marine Corps would be improved as a result, and ultimately the country would benefit from this endeavor. Some enlisted Marines looked upon the idea as a possible encroachment upon their leisure time and officers were inclined to oppose any innovation that might jeopardize the autocratic integrity of the Marine Corps.[3] The intricacies of the problem were indeed extensive, but one month after General Lejeune assumed command at Quantico he established the Automobile Mechanics, Music, and Typewriting and Shorthand schools in order to remedy inept morale. The new schools would form as soon as qualified instructors were found and assigned.[4]

News of this revolutionary experiment was announced in Quantico on November 21, 1919, when The Leatherneck, a

single-sheet post newspaper, ran the large-lettered headline: "PLAY OR GO TO SCHOOL EVERY AFTERNOON IS NEW PROGRAM HERE." The lengthy article discussed details of the new routine, scheduled to go into effect on December 8, 1919, which would free all men of their military duties after noon each day.[5]

The plan called for every afternoon at Quantico to be used for the Marines to take part in opportunities provided in athletics, education, or entertainment. Only those who did not wish to participate were required to work.[6] General Lejeune's philosophy was integral to everything at Quantico, especially the schools.[7] The purposes of the schools were to teach each man some kind of trade or profession, make him a better citizen, and ensure the ability to earn a good livelihood when discharged form the Marine Corps.[8] He wanted everything at Quantico to be the best and believed the Marines would "turn to" and work until they were the best in the line of schooling they chose, just as Marines had a habit of excelling in everything.[9]

Lejeune announced that his program would begin on Monday December 8, 1919 and would offer courses in several vocational areas such as stenography and auto mechanics. Very qualified instructors were assigned from Marines stationed at Quantico and coursework material was planned to

afford each student as thorough a training as the best schools located outside the Marine Corps.[10] Other courses were being planned such as bookkeeping, accounting, and electrical engineering.[11]

CLASSES BEGIN

Classes actually began on Friday December 5, 1919. Lejeune directed an aggressive advertisement campaign and the positive reaction to the plan by the Quantico Marines was reassuring.[12] On December 5, 1919, the post paper carried the headline, "Entries in New Classes Surpass Expectations."[13] More than 70 students attended the first classes of the automobile and typewriting and stenography courses, while still many others enrolled in the courses. The large number of Marines enrolled in the "Gas Engine Design and Operation" course was a pleasant surprise. The 82 enrolled enlisted Marines and officers created mild panic and the instructor had to scramble to provide enough assistant instructors to help teach the course.[14]

The courses were assumed to be for the enlisted Marines, although it was not specifically stated. The unexpected interest shown in the program by so many officers was the first real surprise. When classes began, the second

surprise was observed: officers and enlisted men sat side by side, all united in the quest for knowledge.[15] Enrollments were opened for an electrical engineering course to begin in January 1920.[16]

Another eleven schools were announced on January 2, 1920 in Post Special Order number 299. The schools of Typewriting, Stenography, and Clerical work, Equitation, Forestry, Concrete, Carpentry, Electrical Mechanics, Band Music and Playing, Blacksmithing, Painting, Plumbing, Cooking and Baking, and Drafting were to open on January 5, 1919. A simple reading of the list of Lejeune's schools affirms that these courses were set up to train men for a more useful service career and for an opportunity to enter a gainful occupation upon discharge. This two-fold purpose is still in force today.[17] The original three course enrollments exceeded 200 students.

The official opening of the Vocational Training Schools at Quantico was January 5, 1920.[18] Enrollments continued to grow to 360 and three more courses were added: Spanish, Shoe and Leather Trade, and Newspaper Work and Journalism. The school staff was encouraged by the initial enrollment, variety of subjects, and support from Quantico Marines. The courses, methods, and time available were designed to provide maximum proficiency for the Marines desiring to

attend the schools; however, the schools were referred as the "damned education" by the majority of the non-participants.[19]

General Butler's convocation address brought the preeminent purpose of the schools program into focus. Butler believed a young man who could not afford a private military school or had the political influence to obtain appointment to a military academy could enlist in the Marine Corps and receive an education and military training as good as that offered by an academy. Butler, agreeing with Lejeune, wanted every Marine to be offered a chance to learn a trade and earn a good living after discharge from the service.[20]

Lejeune established several activities at Quantico in 1920 to support the schools and the Marines. The Marine Welfare Employment Bureau directly supported the vocational schools by attempting to fit Marines in the vocational schools to jobs or occupations available upon their separation from the Marine Corps. Various sources provided information to the Bureau and it served as an employment clearing house that worked to not only register all Marines who wanted a job subsequent to discharge but also to correspond with employers who wished to fill vacancies. There was a coordination effort with several corporations

promising to assist graduates in locating employment after discharge.[21]

Soon after the classes began, Secretary of the Navy Daniels wrote to General Butler requesting information on the new Marine Corps Schools.[22] Secretary Daniels received General Butler's enthusiastic reply within three days and authorized a press release announcing the plan of education at Quantico.[23]

In his letter Butler implied that the education plan of the Quantico schools was "nothing more than a huge military university" that would be a "West Point or Naval Academy" in the eyes of the Marine students "but far broader in scope." The plan for the future included a "military university of 6,000 students divided into regimental colleges instructing from 1,500 to 2,000 men each."[24]

Daniels' news release is noteworthy because it contains the first use of the future official name of the school, the "Marine Corps Institute." He called the establishment of a "great educational institution within the Marine Corps that will take rank with the foremost schools of the country."[25] Daniels described the establishment of the organization comprising "a grammar school, a high school, and manual training school and eventually a collegiate course corresponding to that in some of the better small colleges."

Daniels also described references to the Quantico schools' development of standardized courses for export to other stations and the use of experienced institutions, "especially the Correspondence Schools" to assist in the program.[26]

The typical week-day at Quantico was divided in three periods: Marine skills training and development from reveille to the noon meal; vocational class instruction during the afternoon; and "healthful recreation" form the evening meal to taps. The Marines who were close to discharge and had no intention of reenlisting were assigned to guard duty during the school and recreational periods. Daniels' proposal to export the Quantico model throughout the Marine Corps would provide educational opportunities to a larger number of Marines.[27]

Adapting the International Correspondence School Courses

Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee, assigned as the Assistant Chief of Staff, Vocational Training, took charge of the vocational schools on December 12, 1919.[28] Harllee's educational philosophy and forceful manner of accomplishing missions were to have a profound influence on the future development of education policy in the Marine Corps.[29]

While resolving the problems of appropriate course material to accommodate the expanding vocational training needs, Harllee visited the Quantico Y.M.C.A. and noticed a bulletin, "Looking Ahead," from the International Correspondence School (I.C.S.) at Scranton, Pennsylvania. After studying the bulletin, he concluded that correspondence courses were the answer not only to his immediate need but the Marine Corps-wide problem. Correspondence courses were a popular educational medium of various educators of the time.[30] The centralized training and standardization of the I.C.S. courses for instructors answered another problem.[31]

Harllee and his assistant, Captain George K. Shuler, traveled substantially and scrutinized many schools and colleges at all levels. Harllee and Shuler visited the main office of the International Correspondence School from January 26 to February 2, 1920. After close examination of their study materials, Harllee told Mr. Ralph E. Weeks, the President of the I.C.S., and Mr. C. E. Lawrence, the Vice President, that the Quantico schools would like to use all of the course materials, since they were ideally suited for the Quantico schools.[32] The educational philosophy of I.C.S. stressed the habits of industry, concentration, and reliance.[33] Weeks and Lawrence agreed to cooperate with the

Marines in establishing a course of instruction at Quantico.[34] Harllee had not been given official sanction to make any purchases, nor had he been given any money. These facts apparently did not bother him, because he ordered four thousand dollars worth of textbooks, lesson leaflets, study guides, and other materials promising, on his word as a Marie Corps officer, that I.C.S. would be paid at some obscure future date.[35] Harllee and Shuler returned to Quantico on February 2, 1920 with enough materials from I.C.S. to supply each Marine enrolled in the vocational schools.[36]

An influenza epidemic forced the new schools to close for two weeks at the end of January. It reopened on February 2, 1920 with the addition of a few more courses. February 2, 1920 is considered the traditional founding date of the vocational schools.[37] The Vocational Training Schools reopened and began to use International Correspondence Schools' materials in all courses. Enrollments increased during the second week of February 1920 and required the school offices to be moved into larger facilities.[38]

Although Lejeune's program received positive responses, the total number of Marines attending instruction when the schools reopened was about five percent of the population of

the entire post. This indicated relatively little interest in education or self-improvement among the Marines at Quantico, who refused to take advantage of the courses and instruction offered at no charge. Marines, many of whom were barely literate, were exhibiting hostile behavior at Quantico during the first days of this general education episode similar to that which had previously desolated the educational initiatives of Secretary Daniels for the Navy in the pre-War years.[39] Irrespective of the initially small percentage of actual Marine involvement in the Quantico schools, the event was a significant part of the history of general education in the Marine Corps.

Fifty percent of the lessons were sent to Scranton to be graded while Marines were learning the I.C.S. materials and system, and all final examinations were processed there. Marine instructors were assigned to temporary duty at Scranton where they were indoctrinated in the I.C.S. materials and the latest teaching methods. When a student completed a course he received a certificate from I.C.S. as well as from the Marine Corps. If a Marine did not complete a course there was no entry made in his service record book.[40]

Marine Corps General Education Begins to Expand

Harllee announced that Marines who were enrolled in courses and were transferred from Quantico to other posts could continue their course work through correspondence at their new post. The Marines corresponded directly with I.C.S. as they completed their courses. This policy would solve any problems as a result of transfers and was in harmony with the Lejeune's basic philosophy.[41]

Harllee also announced that the vocational schools courses were available to the civilian employees at Quantico. There was much enthusiasm from the civilian employees; however, it was decided that the I.C.S. courses would not be offered to civilian employees free of charge as was the case with the Marines.[42] The average cost for an I.C.S. course was 110 dollars.[43]

This experimental program quickly gained official approval from Major General Commandant George Barnett. He sanctioned the "comprehensive scheme of education" offered at Quantico in a letter to Lejeune on February 10, 1920.[44] Barnett approved of the basic concept of education for Marines when time was available; however, he was not in favor of "enlistment promises" because of unforeseen distractions or manpower requirements that could impact on

the completion of any particular course.[45] Barnett particularly liked the idea of officers taking turn as instructors for not only their development, but the good of the Marine Corps.[46]

Lejeune articulated a wider philosophy when he addressed the entire command at Quantico on February 18, 1920 to explain the future plans for the schools at Quantico. The courses, Lejeune noted, provided training for "good positions on the outside" and helped earn promotions for those Marines remaining on active duty. The use of I.C.S. course materials provided an opportunity for Marines to continue their education if they were transferred to another post. He envisioned the school as an institution capable of teaching all of the courses found in a grammar school, high school, manual training school, or college and enrolling 9,000 Marines.[47] Students attending Virginia Military Institute, Culver, Pennsylvania Military Academy, and other received excellent education with only two hours of military drill and instruction per day. Lejeune believed that by combining scholastic work with military training the Marine Corps would produce similar results and make good Marines and better citizens.[48]

Queries by House Naval Affairs Committee

The success of the vocational schools was queried by a legislative group on February 26, 1920, when the House Naval Affairs Committee summoned Generals Lejeune and Butler to testify on the new educational program. The Committee wanted to know if it was possible to turn these "schoolboys" into an effective fighting force and if a fighting force could learn marketable skills on a voluntary basis if the opportunity was provided. General Lejeune, firm in his convictions, answered that there used to be an old theory that the soldier ought to be illiterate and like dumb, driven cattle. He felt that the experience in the World War showed the more intelligence, the more education, and the more initiative a man has, the better soldier he is. He went on to describe the original morale-lifting goal of the Marine schools at Quantico. The visitors also wanted to know what effect the schools had on the spirit of the men. Lejeune answered that unquestionably there was great improvement in the spirit of the men. You can tell that by hearing them speak and looking in their faces. He said that he saw the most intense interest on every face and that they devoted attention to their work and study.[49]

As the hearing progressed, Lejeune illustrated how different facets of the programs affected the men. Lejeune told the committee of the curiosity of Marines from other posts interested in "the Quantico Idea." Harllee led the team of visiting Marines on a tour of Marine Corps Posts for the purpose of providing information about the M.C.I. and to encourage enrollment. The visiting Marines went around to all of the classes and talked to the men. The Marines said Quantico's schools were the finest thing they ever saw.[50] Secretary Daniels and Major General Commandant George Barnett endorsed Lejeune's education plan at the hearing.[51]

When the hearing ended, General Lejeune invited the legislators to see the Marine Corps Institute in action. On March 5, 1920, the Secretary of the Navy and the House Naval Affairs Committee visited Quantico. With intensity characteristic of Harllee the word was passed that every Marine at Quantico must have a book when the Committee made its inspection.[52] The visitors were very much pleased with the "high grade of intelligence shown by the students and surprised and delighted at the earnest determination shown by the men to better themselves and acquire knowledge."[53] The visitors praised the success of the Marine Corps' design of general education for officers and enlisted men alike. Representative William Kettner of California's eleventh

district believed that the "movement would eventually cause the enrollment of one of the best young men in the country in the Marine service."[54] Kettner also wanted the system of "liberal education" to be adopted at the Marine Base in San Diego.[55]

In an address to the staff of the Vocational Schools Detachment Secretary Daniels stated that throughout his entire career as Secretary of the Navy he had hoped for a school of this kind, and that he was delighted to see it. He told of his unsuccessful efforts to realize a similar scheme in the Navy and said that the Marine Corps schools at Quantico proved the practicality of his ideas.[56]

The Vice president of I.C.S., C. E. Lawrence, and Field Superintendent B. W. Burdick, visited Quantico in mid-March, 1920 to attend meetings and inspect the instruction within the schools. They expressed their satisfaction with the progress of the activities and pledged continued support from I.C.S.[57]

Further Interest in the Quantico Schools

The Navy News Bureau published news of the Quantico schools, causing a great deal of attention. The Marine Corps Headquarters received numerous queries regarding the

educational activities at Quantico. The widespread interest in the Quantico schools prompted the Headquarters to issue an order on March 26, 1920, permitting Marine recruits to enlist specifically for duty at Quantico for the purpose of attending the Vocational Schools Detachment courses. The recruits had to successfully complete recruit training at Parris Island, South Carolina and then be assigned to Quantico. After completion of the Vocational Schools Detachment course of instruction, the Marine would be assigned as required. This order affected those Marines enlisting between April 1 and May 1, 1920.[58] The order also permitted any Army, Navy, or Marine on active duty or recently discharged from active duty to re-enlist in the Marine Corps and be transferred directly to Quantico.[59]

In late March, 1920 Lejeune and Butler visited I.C.S. at Scranton, Pennsylvania to discuss improvements in the post schools at Quantico. They were also interested in administration of correspondence and advertising methods to increase awareness.[60]

The schools at Quantico continued to grow and were moved into the offices spaces formerly occupied by the Marine Barracks Detachment personnel.[61] On April 1, 1920 the post schools were officially designated the Vocational Schools Detachment, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Virginia.[62]

During the month of April, Lieutenant Colonel Harllee assembled his administrative and instructional staff for meetings. The meetings were to provide a forum for the schools staff to "exchange views, present ideas, and discuss ways and means" for more efficient and effective education. Several policies and procedures were revised to improve the efficiency of the Vocational Schools Detachment's courses as a result of these meetings. Also in April a correspondence branch was established to duplicate correspondence capabilities of I.C.S. and accommodate planned expansion of courses to all Marine Corps posts. Another policy change provided that Marines discharged prior to the completion of courses could complete those courses with I.C.S. and the cost would be prorated. Family members of Marines could now be enrolled in the courses at no charge. The I.C.S. Employment Bureau services were to be offered to students of Vocational Schools Detachment.[63]

THE MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE EMERGES

The popularity of the Vocational Schools Detachment, now being called the Marine Corps Institute, was used in recruitment. Recruiters were requesting photographs of the institution, literature on the institute, and reports of its

activity. Recruits asked to be sent to Quantico after recruit training in order to take advantage of one course or another.[64] A standard letter describing the education program at Quantico was also provided to each recruit. The idea of the vocational schools and the opportunities provided was a boon to recruiting following the World War.[65]

The Leatherneck began to devote an ever-increasing amount of space to news from the Quantico schools. It also featured editorials dealing with general education topics such as "Hints on How to Write an Essay" or "Points on Punctuation." Subscriptions for The Leatherneck were provided to all recruiters because of interest and inquiries of the vocational schools program from potential recruits.[66]

The First Challenge

The vocational schools were going very well for Harllee at Quantico when an event occurred that challenged the ability of the program to support Marines "Corps-wide." A battalion of Marines from Quantico were dispatched for expeditionary duty to Mexican waters in reaction to a crisis in Mexico, during May, 1920. Six hundred fifty of the 1200 Marines in the battalion were students of the vocational schools and most of the them wanted to continue their course

work while on board their ship, the USS Henderson.[67] Harllee promptly and carefully arranged to ensure that the students could continue their study and work. Harllee also directed First Lieutenant LeGette to accompany the battalion, act as a liaison for the schools, and enroll any Marine requesting schooling within the battalion. LeGette's supplies and equipment requirements were also carefully arranged. Within a few hours locker boxes filled with textbooks, large supplies of pencils, paper and instruments, were ready for shipment to the Henderson. Each box was neatly and plainly marked: "U.S. Marine Corps Institute".[68]

The students within the battalion off the coast of Mexico did not interrupt their study. LeGette kept the schools' detachment busy with a large number of lessons and examination papers and several new enrollments. Two weeks after the battalion had departed from Quantico, lessons and examination papers were received and processed. Examination papers arrived in with the mail. The mail also brought applications for enrollment and requisitions for supplies of textbooks. The expeditionary nature of the Marine Corps did not alter Lejeune's plan upon which the system of schools was founded. Harllee was very gratified with the results of the deployment and the ability to support the Marine students anywhere.[69]

The success of the correspondence method of education was so great that when General Lejeune was appointed Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, in June, 1920, one of his first official acts was to authorize Lieutenant Colonel Harllee to extend the scope of the "institute" to the entire corps. Thus it was that every Marine was given the opportunity--an opportunity still present--to improve his education regardless of his duty station. The expanded variety of courses enabled Marines to select courses related to experiences.[70]

The First Graduates

On May 14, 1920 the M.C.I. had graduated its first student, an instructor in the School of Agriculture, Corporal Walter C. Erwin. Corporal Erwin was an excellent student, so much so that he was appointed examiner-instructor of the schools after undergoing 10 days of special instruction in the I.C.S. at Scranton, Pa.[71] When Erwin returned from Scranton, he was promoted to Sergeant. He accepted a discharge from the Marine Corps before the end of 1920 to devote his time to agriculture in Jefferson, Virginia. His education in M.C.I. served him well until ill health forced him out of farming in 1938. Erwin commented

in a letter about his experience in the vocational schools program:

> As my association with the Institute, it will always have a cherished place in my memories. I enjoyed my association with the men and officers. General Butler was very interested in the school's progress, as well as the other officers who were instructors.[72]

The second graduate and first officer graduate was Captain A. J. Stout. Stout was also the Principal of the School of Agriculture and completed the Livestock course on May 17,1920.[73]

By May 1920 Lejeune's program was a world-wide activity for Marines. President Weeks of I.C.S. indicated during a visit to Quantico in May 1920 that so many Marines enrolled in the I.C.S. from different parts of the world were creating difficulty in the administration of the correspondence.[74] The diplomas for course graduates were to have a M.C.I. notation attached to the regular I.C.S. diplomas.[75]

The first I.C.S.-M.C.I. diploma was awarded August 10, 1920 at the post gymnasium at Quantico. Commandant Lejeune presented the diplomas to seven graduates. It was announced on August 14, 1920 that officers and enlisted Marines on the retired list could enroll in the I.C.S. courses through M.C.I. The success and growth of M.C.I. continued without

Harllee's presence to personally administer the operations.[76]

THE MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE IS ESTABLISHED

The educational activity that began in December 1919 had been called the Post Schools, the Quantico Schools, the Vocational Schools, The Marine Corps Institute, the Marine Corps University, and several other names. References to Quantico's educational program and specifically the schools was confusing. The matter of an agreeable name was settled with the June 11, 1920 publication of the Marine Corps Institute Bulletin Number 1. The order stated the establishment of the schools as the MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE (M.C.I.). The designation U.S. Marine Corps Institute was too long. The official title of the organization that supported M.C.I., however, was the VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS DETACHMENT.[77] On June 30, 1920 General Butler had succeeded Lejeune as the Commander of the Marine Barracks at Quantico, as well as the Vocational Schools Detachment. The official title of the Vocational Schools Detachment was changed on July 1, 1920 to the Marine Corps Institute Detachment.[78]

On that same date Lieutenant Colonel Harllee was detached from Marine Barracks, Quantico and ordered to

Marine Corps Headquarters in Washington, D.C. as Chief of the Educational Section.[79] When the Marines at Quantico ascertained Harllee was to leave Quantico for Washington a spontaneous and emotional farewell was displayed by the staff and students of M.C.I. The staff expressed their regrets at losing Harllee and pledged that the high standards would be maintained.[80]

Captain George Shuler became the Director of the Marine Corps Institute and the Commanding Officer of the Marine Corps Institute Detachment. Shuler had been identified with the M.C.I. since its inception and had maintained a deep interest in the work through all the difficulties of its early development and was well fitted for the work.[81]

On August 14, 1920 Lejeune issued an order describing the policy of the relationship between officers and enlisted men enrolled in M.C.I. courses. There would be no sense of superior and inferior nor that of master and servant, but rather that of teacher and scholar. Officers not only were to continue devoting close attention to the comfort, health, military training and discipline of the men under their command, but also to encourage their men to enroll in the Marine Corps Institute and to keep up their studies after enrollment.[82]

The Marine Corps Institute Moves

The M.C.I. increased significantly from less than 900 in June 1920 to over 4,000 in October 1920.[83] This rapid growth created additional overhead administration requirements for the staff at Quantico. A frustration over the seemingly unsurmountable workload began to demoralize the small M.C.I. staff. It became apparent to Lejeune, Butler, and Harllee that the Institute was in jeopardy, partially because of its success. The Marine Corps could not continue to provide classroom instruction to every Marine as it was initially envisioned nor could M.C.I. at Quantico continue to maintain the increasing requirements to provide administrative services with its small staff. Harllee wanted to revive the effort and requested that the Commandant either transfer Harllee to Quantico or move M.C.I. to the Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. where it would be in direct control of Harllee and free of any distractions. On November 10, 1920 General Butler agreed to "get rid of the thing," orders were issued, and with the use of a tug boat, the entire M.C.I. was towed up the Potomac River to Washington on a barge.[84] M.C.I. would operate directly under the Major General Commandant with Harllee in charge of its operation.[85]

Upon the relocation of M.C.I. to Washington, D.C. Lejeune announced on November 12, 1920 that M.C.I. would manage "its instruction entirely in the correspondence school method." The letter to all officers and recruiting stations explained that M.C.I. would not conduct classroom instruction and that Marines were not to be led to believe that they should expect classroom instruction. Some posts would provide some classroom instruction, but this was not a Marine Corps-wide policy.[86]

Commandant Lejeune Influences M.C.I

Now Commandant, Lejeune was also concerned with the economical efficiency of M.C.I. and the education it provided to Marines.[87] The active duty Marines, their families, officers and enlisted on the retired list, and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve were still permitted to enroll in the I.C.S. courses at no charge. Funding for M.C.I. was a part of the "Maintenance Marine Corps" appropriations and not from special appropriations as was the case with the Army and Navy for their general education activities.[88]

Daniels was pleased with the move of M.C.I. to Washington and the method of instruction chosen to carry out the educational opportunities.[89] His initial concern was

that the new institution provide "books" to its students in a timely manner.[90]

Lejeune directed a reorganization of Headquarters, Marine Corps effective December 1, 1920. The significant reorganization was within the Operations and Training Division that now contained a new section: the Educational Section. This section would have charge of the Marine Corps Institute, Correspondence Courses, Post Schools (other than military), Enrollments in schools, School supplies, and textbooks. Harllee was the Educational Section Head.[91] The Marine Corps now had institutionalized general education Corps-wide in a similar manner as the larger Services.

SUMMARY

General Lejeune assumed command of Quantico Marine Corps Base a year after the World War I armistice, and established the Vocational Schools Detachment. He was convinced it was best to build the morale of the officers and men so he conquered many obstacles and prototyped the Marine Corps Institute by vindicating Daniels' philosophy of the military services benefiting their members. Lejeune incorporated this philosophy; however, where Daniels had failed in an over ambitious "Navy University," Lejeune

succeeded by beginning on a more calculated and smaller scale activity, the Vocational Schools Detachment. Lejeune envisioned a replica of the A.E.F. University model providing an opportunity for every Marine to obtain an education.

Lejeune was a visionary and hoped Marines would enlist and remain in the Marine Corps to better themselves, the standards of the Marine Corps would be improved, as a result, and ultimately the country would benefit from this endeavor. Classes began on December 5, 1919 with more than 70 students attending the first classes of the automobile, typewriting, and stenography courses. Lejeune established several support activities to fit Marines in the vocational schools to jobs or occupations available upon their separation from the Marine Corps.

Daniels was first to use the name "Marine Corps Institute" in a news release. He described the educational institution within the Marine Corps as "great" and ranked with the foremost schools of the country. The release also described the organization of the school as a grammar school, a high school, manual training school and eventually collegiate courses corresponding to some of the better small colleges in the United States.

Lieutenant Colonel Harllee, after studying the I.C.S. bulletin "Looking Ahead," concluded that correspondence courses were the answer to the problem of appropriate course material to accommodate the expanding vocational training needs. Correspondence courses were not only a popular educational medium of various educators of the time, but the centralized training and standardization of the I.C.S. courses for instructors resolved other problems. Harllee and his assistant, Captain Shuler, traveled substantially and scrutinized many schools and colleges at all levels in early 1920. After close examination of the I.C.S. study materials they concluded these materials were ideally suited for the Quantico schools. Harllee and Shuler returned to Quantico on February 2, 1920 with enough materials from I.C.S. to supply each Marine enrolled in the vocational schools.

This experimental program quickly gained official approval from Major General Commandant Barnett. He approved of the basic concept of education for Marines when time was available and particularly liked the idea of officers taking turn as instructors for not only their development, but the good of the Marine Corps. The success of the vocational schools was queried by a legislative group on February 26, 1920, when the House Naval Affairs Committee summoned

Generals Lejeune and Butler to testify on the new educational program.

A battalion of Marines from Quantico dispatched for expeditionary duty in reaction to a crisis in Mexico, during May, 1920 challenged the ability to support the program "Corps-wide." Six hundred fifty of the 1200 Marines in the battalion were students of the vocational schools and most of the them wanted to continue their course work while on board their ship, the USS Henderson. First Lieutenant LeGette accompanied the battalion, acted as a liaison for the schools, and enrolled any Marines requesting schooling within the battalion to ensure that students could continue their study and work. Supplies and equipment requirements were carefully arranged. The students off the coast of Mexico did not interrupt their study. Two weeks after the battalion had departed from Quantico, lessons and examination papers were received and processed. The expeditionary nature of the Marine Corps did not alter Lejeune's plan upon which the system of schools was founded.

The success of the correspondence method of education was so great that when General Lejeune was appointed Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, in June, 1920, one of his first official acts was to authorize Harllee to extend the scope of the "institute" to the entire corps.

Every Marine was given the opportunity to improve his education regardless of his duty station. The expanded variety of courses enabled Marines to select courses related to experiences.

M.C.I. increased significantly from less than 900 in June 1920 to over 4,000 in October 1920. This rapid growth created additional overhead administration requirements for the staff at Quantico. A frustration over the seemingly unsurmountable workload began to demoralize the small M.C.I. staff. It became apparent to Lejeune and Harllee that the Institute was in jeopardy, partially because of its success. The Marine Corps could not continue to provide classroom instruction to every Marine as it was initially envisioned nor could M.C.I. at Quantico continue to maintain the increasing requirements to provide administrative services with its small staff. On November 10, 1920 orders were issued, and with the use of a tug boat, the entire M.C.I. was towed up the Potomac river to Washington on a barge and would operate directly under Lejeune with Harllee in charge of its operation. Lejeune announced on November 12, 1920 that M.C.I. would manage "its instruction entirely in the correspondence school method." Funding for M.C.I. was a part of the "Maintenance Marine Corps" appropriations and

not from special appropriations as was the case with the Army and Navy for their general education activities.

The educational activity that began in December 1919 had been called the Post Schools, the Quantico Schools, the Vocational Schools, The Marine Corps Institute, the Marine Corps University, and several other names. References to Quantico's educational program and specifically the schools was confusing. The matter of a agreeable name was settled with the June 11, 1920 publication of the Marine Corps Institute Bulletin Number 1. The order stated the establishment of the schools as the MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE (M.C.I.). The official title of the Vocational Schools Detachment was changed on July 1, 1920 to the Marine Corps Institute Detachment. On that same date Lieutenant Colonel Harllee was detached from Marine Barracks, Quantico and ordered to Marine Corps Headquarters in Washington, D.C. as Chief of the Educational Section.

Although Lejeune's program received positive responses, the total number of Marines attending instruction was about five percent of the population of the Quantico post. This indicated relatively little interest in education or self-improvement among the Marines at Quantico, who refused to take advantage of the courses and instruction offered at no charge. Marines, many of whom were barely literate, were

exhibiting hostile behavior at Quantico during the first days of this general education episode similar to that which had previously desolated the educational initiatives of Daniels for the Navy in the pre-War years. Vocational courses focused on civilian equivalent labor skills that would establish each Marine with career training and a marketable skill upon military discharge. The "university" concept at Quantico, compared to West Point and the Naval Academy, encountered success in its endeavor to educate enlisted men and officers in general education and specific civilian equivalent labor skills. M.C.I., along with the establishment of the Educational Section at Headquarters, Marine Corps, institutionalized general education and was a significant part of the history of general education in the Marine Corps.

NOTES

1. John A. Lejeune, Testimony, U.S. Congress Hearings Before Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on Estimates Submitted by the Secretary of the Navy 1920, Vol.2. (1821-3420), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1920, 1827.

2. J. H. Craige, "Vocational Training in the Marine Corps", Marine Corps Gazette, 1920, 32.

3. Gaynor Pearson, The United States Marine Corps Institute, unpublished thesis,(Washington: George Washington University, 1938), 41.

4. "All Work To Be Cut Out After Dinner And Time Given To Athletics and Education," The Leatherneck, 21 November, 1919, 1. The Post order was issued in the local post paper, the Leatherneck, and established the commencement of the vocational schools. The headlines read "Play or Go to School Every Afternoon Is the New Program." The periodical went on to describe the program: "Quantico will shortly be transformed into a hive of sporting, educational, and recreational activity when the plans of the Post Commander, Major General John A. Lejeune and his Chief of Staff, Brigadier General S. D. Butler, go into effect. Like the place in the song where "Every day is Sunday and the people never work," every afternoon in Quantico will be a holiday and no Marine will be required to work unless!!!--he absolutely refuses to play, or go to school or sing or join an amateur theatrical troupe or take music lessons with the band, or in other words to take any part in the program of athletics, education, or entertainment being mapped out."

5. Lejeune, Testimony, 1827.

6. Ibid. Within the testimony was the quote "If any Marine is found who does persist in refusing to do any or all these things, he will first be examined to see if he is sane and then sentenced to extra kitchen and camp police for life."

7. Craige, 32.

8. "All Work To Be Cut Out After Dinner And Time Given To Athletics and Education," 1 and "Entries in New Classes

Surpass Expectations," The Leatherneck, 5 December, 1919, 1. The intention of the program was reiterated in The Leatherneck: "Opportunity is offered to men of this Post to have instruction in various lines that will assist them to be of great service to the Marine Corps, and to themselves upon expiration of enlistment."

9. Craige, 32.

10. Craige, 38-39 and "Expert Teachers Have Been Secured First Term to End March Thirteenth," The Leatherneck, 26 November, 1919, 1. A surprising number of men were found with qualifications of the highest type for such work. Officers and men were found who were graduates of such institutions as the U.S. Naval Academy, Harvard Law School, Massachusetts Tech, Stevens Institute, Colorado School of Mines, and other leading institutions. Others were found who had received training in the great industrial corporations, such as the General Electric Company, the Standard Oil Company, the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the Carnegie Steel Company, and a number of others. A French instructor was found who had studied in the University of Paris; and a Mexican, a corporal in the Post Band, a graduate of one of the great schools of Mexico City, volunteered to take classes in Spanish language and literature.

11. "Expert Teachers Have Been Secured First Term to End March Thirteenth," 1, Ibid.

12. Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Navy for Fiscal Year 1920, (Washington: United States Navy Department, 1920), 382.

13. John Harllee, The Marine From Manatee: A Tradition of Rifle Marksmanship, (Washington: National Rifle Association of America, 1984), 230.

14. "Entries in New Classes Surpass Expectations," 1.

15. Harllee, 230.

16. "The Post Automobile School Monday With A Record Attendance," The Leatherneck, 12 December, 1919, 1, George A. Harter, "The Marine Corps Institute," The Marines Magazine and Indian, September, 1920, 13.

17. Harllee, 240-241, and "Here Is Your Chance To Learn A Very Good Trade," and "Post Special Order Number 299," The Leatherneck, 2 January, 1920, 1.

18. Harter, Ibid.

19. Harllee, 245, and Harter, 13. Harter believed the ambition of Lejeune and Harllee of M.C.I. wanted to put the entire Marine Corps on the same basis as of a high grade military academy such as Culver or Virginia Military Institute.

20. Harllee, 243-244, and "Post Schools Open With An Enrollment of 360 Students," The Leatherneck, 9 January, 1920, 1.

21. Official Letter from General S. D. Butler to Secretary Daniels, Quantico, Va., January 13, 1920.

22. Official Letter from the Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels to General S. D. Butler, Washington, D.C. January 10, 1920. Daniels was also interested in announcing the new schools to newspapers to aid Marine Corps recruiting.

23. News release from the Navy News Bureau, Washington, D.C. January 24, 1920. Secretary of the Navy Daniels authorized the news release.

24. Official Letter from General S. D. Butler, January 13, 1920.

25. News release from the Navy News Bureau, Washington, D.C. January 24, 1920. The significant portion of the news release included the name "Marine Corps Institute" and praise for Lejeune's program: "Creation of a great educational institution within the Marine Corps that will take rank with the foremost schools of the country is the ultimate aim of the school at Quantico, Virginia, the Marine Corps base and training school for expeditionary duty. it is known as the U.S. Marine Corps Institute."

26. Ibid, and unpublished notes written by Josephus Daniels in early 1920, Josephus Daniels Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

27. Official Letter from General S. D. Butler, January 13, 1920.

28. Muster Roll of Officer and Enlisted Men of the United States Marine Corps, Barracks Detachment, Marine Barracks Quantico, Virginia, for the Period December 1 to December 31, 1919, Marine Corps Historical Division, Washington, D.C., and Harter, Ibid.

29. Fred A. Ruoff, "The Story of a Dream," Marine Corps Gazette, February, 1950, 15-17.

30. Alonzo G. Grace, Educational Lessons From Wartime Training, (washington: American Council on Education, 1948), 158.

31. Harllee, 242, and The Annual Reports for Fiscal Year 1920, 383, and Harter, 13.

32. Ruoff, 18, and "School Here To Use I.C.S. Text Books in its Courses," The Leatherneck, February 6, 1920, 1.

33. The Ideal of the I.C.S. Fraternity of the World, (Scranton: The Fraternity Supply Company, 1908), 9, 14.

34. "Kinsfolk," copy of a presentation from International Correspondence School to William Harllee, Scranton, Pa., 1935, Historical Branch, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D. C. The presentation indicated continued cooperation and collaboration from M.C.I.'s beginning.

35. Ruoff, 18.

36. The Leatherneck, February 6, 1920, Ibid.

37. E. David Cronon, The Cabinet Diaries of Josephus Daniels 1913-1921, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), 503 and "Press and Public Commend Institute Latest Feature of Marine Training," Recruiters' Bulletin, July, 1920, 3-4. This article condensed several newspaper accounts of the Marine Corps Institute and its popularity. After only six months of operation people began to take notice of the "Quantico idea" and it was praised as one of the best solution of the past-War problem of how to make service life better for enlisted men and prepare them for civilian life. The New York Times noted the popularity of

M.C.I. and that many of the classes were crowded to the limit. The New York Tribune indicated the novelty of a university that is voluntary, provides education and training for a civilian trade, and does not ask the Congress to appropriate funds for its operation. Other accolades praised the training of minds and bodies. M.C.I. was well received by readers of many large cities' newspapers around the country. Recruiters were asked more often about educational opportunities than the pay, travel, or duty stations the Marine Corps offered.

38. Harllee, 242, The Leatherneck, February 6, 1920, Ibid, and Harter, 20.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Harter, 20.

44. Official Letter from Major General Commandant George Barnett to Major General Lejeune, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., February 10, 1920, 1, 3.

45. Ibid, 2.

46. Ibid.

47. "General Lejeune Outlined Plan For The School System," The Leatherneck, February 20, 1920, 1.

48. J. H. Craige, "Vocational Training in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette,March, 1920, 38.

49. Cronon, 503.

50. Ibid, "Colonel Harllee On Tour For U.S. M.C.I.," The Leatherneck, July 17, 1920, 1 and 3, and "The Service With a Future," (Touring Posts for M.C.I.), Recruiters Bulletin, August, 1920, 7. Lieutenant Colonel Harllee's team included First Lieutenant Edward A. Platt, Sergeant Robert S.Sparks, Sergeant George Harter, and Sergeant Ellyn C. Rowe.

51. "Naval Affairs Committee Learns of Quantico Schools," The Leatherneck, February 27, 1920, 1.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Official Letter from the honorable William Kettner (House of Representatives, California 11th District), to Major General J. H. Pendleton, Washington, D. C., March 6, 1920.

55. Ibid.

56. Harllee, 242.

57. "Educators In Quantico To Visit Schools," The Leatherneck, March 12, 1920, 1.

58. "Will Start To Recruit For Schools Here," The Leatherneck, March 26, 1920, 1.

59. Ibid.

60. "Generals Lejeune and Butler Visit Scranton," The Leatherneck, April 2, 1920, 1, and Travel Orders for Major General John Lejeune and Brigadier General Smedley Butler, United States Marine Corps, Office of the Post Commander, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., March 27, 1920.

61. Ibid.

62. Muster Roll for Marine Barracks, Quantico, Virginia, for the period 1 April to 30 April, 1920, Historical Division, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

63. "Colonel Harllee Speaks Out At The School Meeting," The Leatherneck, April 9, 1920, 1; "Queries About United States Marine Corps Institute," The Leatherneck, April 16, 1920, 1; and "Head Of Commercial Department, I.C.S., Speaks,", The Leatherneck, April 27, 1920, 1.

64. Official Letter from Major J. C. Fegan to Brigadier General S. D. Butler., U.S. Marine Corps, Western Recruiting Division, Los Angles, Ca., August 25, 1920.

65. "Of Interest To Recruiters," The Leatherneck, May 14, 1920, 3, and Harter, 20.

66. Ibid, 246-247.

67. Quantico: Crossroads of the Corps, (Washington: History and Museum Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1978), 42.

68. "Marine Institute Sends Teachers To Help Men Continue Studies," The Leatherneck, May 14, 1920, 1, and Annual Reports of the Navy Department for the Fiscal Year 1920, (Washington: United States Navy, 1921), 1020-1022. The article continued to report in this manner textbooks were shipped. There were 80 automobile course textbooks, 6 Drafting course textbooks, 20 Bookkeeping course textbooks, and 105 Spanish course textbooks. At the last minute 75 additional Spanish course textbooks were included in the shipment.

69. "Marine Corps Institute Branch Popular With Men of the Sixteenth Regiment," The Leatherneck, May 28, 1920, 3.

70. Harllee, 243-244 and Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy for the Fiscal Year 1920, 1071.

71. "Our First Graduate," The Leatherneck, May 21, 1920, 3. Corporal Erwin may well be proud of the honor of being the first Marine graduate from the U.S. Marine Corps Institute. From the very beginning he stood at the head of his class, so much that he was appointed examiner-instructor in our schools. On account of his excellent work on this duty, he was recently promoted from Private to Corporal and is now undergoing 10 days of special instruction in the I.C.S. at Scranton, Pa.

72. Letter from Walter C. Erwin to Marine Corps Institute, February 28, 1938.

73. The Leatherneck, May 21, 1920, Ibid.

74. "Mr. Lawrence Visits Institute," The Leatherneck, May 28, 1920, 3.

75. "Marine Corps Institute Diplomas," The Leatherneck, June 4, 1920, 3.

76. "Bulletin Number 1," The Leatherneck, June 11, 1920, 4.

77. John A. Lejeune, Reminiscences of a Marine, (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1930), 460.

78. Muster Roll for the Marine Corps Institute Detatchment, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Virginia, for the period July 1, 1920 to July 31, 1920,

79. "The Service With a Future," Ibid, Muster Roll for the period 1 July to 31 July, 1920, and Harllee, 460.

80. "The Service With a Future," Ibid, Muster Roll for the period 1 July to 31 July, 1920, and Harllee, Ibid.

81. "Colonel Harllee Departs Quantico," The Leatherneck, July 10, 1920, 4-6. The staff and students were appreciative of Harllee's efforts with the schools at Quantico. The article accounts: "...just at the moment the Colonel stepped from around the corner of the building, and it was apparent to every one that he had no idea of what was in store for him. As he stepped out on the platform the command, "Present Arms" was given by Gy.Sgt. Cooper, and as one man the rifles of the guard of honor snapped up to position. When the "order arms" was given, Corp. George A. Harter stepped to the front, and speaking for the staff of the Marine Corps Institute, expressed their regrets for losing the Colonel, and pledged him on behalf of the men of the detachment, that the high standards instilled by the Colonel would be maintained. Colonel Harllee responded, thanking the men, and if could readily be seen that he was deeply affected by the farewell demonstration "his boys" gave him. As the Colonel boarded the train the detachment begun cheering, and the entire throats the name "Harllee" resounded throughout the entire camp.'

82. "The Service With a Future," Ibid.

83. "Military Efficiency," Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Order Number 1620, (Series 1920), (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1920), 1.

84. "Weekly Report of U.S. Marine Corps Institute, October 5, 1920," The Leatherneck, November 6, 1920, 6.

85. Harllee, 460, and Muster Roll for Marine Corps Institute Detachment, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., for the period 1 November to 30 November, 1920, Historical Division, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

86. "The Quantico Barrage," The Marines Magazine and Indian, December, 1920, 10.

87. Official Letter, Major General Commandant to all Officers and Man of the Recruiting Services, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., November 12,1920, Subject: "The Marine Corps Institute". Lejeune's philosophy was imbedded in this letter. He reflected in a letter, February 14, 1938: "After getting settled down in Washington the Marine Corps Institute and Headquarters undertook strenuously to interest each Marine in the opportunity offered by the Institute to obtain a free education. The response was very gratifying, and that the Institute filled a long felt want is shown by the fact that its success has continued without interruption from the time of its establishment to the present day." A. J. Foy Cross, Relative Success in certain Correspondence Courses of Pupils at Various Levels of Mental Ability and Reading Abilities, Thesis presented to University of Nebraska Faculty, June, 1936, 9. indicated that after 1923 there was a steady increase in number of schools that utilized correspondence courses as part of the school program. Many other institutions outside the Marine Corps invested into the correspondence method of instruction as a means of providing educational opportunities to an increasing number of students.

88. "The Marine Corps Institute for 1922," The Leatherneck, January 6, 1922, 1.

89. "Proves Well Adopted to Service Conditions," The Leatherneck, October 30, 1920, 1.

90. Official Letter from Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels to Lieutenant Colonel William Harllee, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C., December 1, 1920.

91. Ibid.

92. "Reorganization of the United States Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, December, 1920, 415-417.

CHAPTER V

MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION REFINES PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE: 1920-1948

Modern Marine Corps general education actually began in 1919 and after a year of evolution it matured into the Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.). From 1920 through the depression to the beginning of World War II was a period of stabilization for M.C.I. and Marine Corps general education. During World War II M.C.I. started to align its mission with new tasks mandated by the requirements and needs of the multitude of wartime Marines. After 1948 still other tasks dictated further changes in the mission of M.C.I. that will be discussed in the next chapter. This chapter will discuss two major developments in Marine Corps training and education: professional training and education and M.C.I.'s provision of general education for Marines.

MARINE CORPS DEVELOPS PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The Marine Corps mission oriented training and education schools conducted at Quantico, Virginia began in response to a wartime need for a greatly expanded Marine Corps.[1] In February of 1917, the first officers' school,

originally called the Marine Officers' Training Camp, later changed to the Marine Officers' Training School, was assembled at Quantico to provide second lieutenants a short course in the basic duties of a Marine Corps.[2] Quantico had become a permanent part of the Marine Corps by the time World War I had ended. In 1919 the Marine Officers' Infantry School was established at Quantico.[3] Aviation units were also introduced in 1919.[4] However, the most significant addition to Quantico was the wartime field commander, Major General John A. Lejeune.

Lejeune's Vision of Formal Schools

Lejeune was determined that the Marine Corps would be a pioneer of productive military thought in the future and that Quantico would be the seat for training and education. Consequently, in 1920 the unrelated officer and military skills training and education were reorganized into a permanent institution for officer education called the Marine Corps Schools.[5] Lejeune believed that an officer should have a broad general education, which would complement military education to the extent required to reach the first objective, and then undertake the acquiring

of an adequate education in some special branch of his profession.

Lejeune established his plan for professional officer education in the Marine Corps. His philosophy of professional education was concise: the Marine Corps needs a well educated officer corps. He believed there were essentials, learned via education and training, to ensure that every officer is competent to command. He wanted all officers educated in accordance with the probable responsibilities of their rank. He wanted all line officers to be educated to the command supporting and maneuver elements of the smallest infantry unit, the platoon. He wanted to develop specialists in branches of supply and supporting arms such as artillery (field and fixed defenses), engineer and signal, special base troops, and aviation. He also wanted to develop some specialists for such details, who are well educated in the subjects of military government, international law, military law, administrative law, and the art of government in general. Finally, he wanted a certain number of the senior Marine Corps officers to be educated in general staff work.[6] This philosophy complimented his general education philosophy.

Marine Corps Schools

The Marine Corps Schools that developed according to Lejeune's philosophy included the Field Officers' School, the Company Grade School, and the Basic School, all established in 1920. The Field Officers' School, established for senior Marine Corps officers, offered officers in infantry commands to fill more important staff positions. The Company School, established for officers in the grade of lieutenant and captain, prepared students to function as infantry company commanders, as staff officers in infantry regiments, and as staff officers in permanent posts. It also prepared officers for special details such as members, recorder or judge-advocate of courts and boards, and as post-exchange officer. The Basic School was established for second lieutenants to prepare them to function as infantry platoon commanders.[7] The Basic School was moved to Philadelphia from Quantico in 1924 due to congestion and lack of quarters for second lieutenants.[8] The sequence of instruction was lecture, demonstration, application, and test.[9]

The establishment of the Marine Corps formal schools followed a similar evolution as with the Army and Navy a century earlier. The Army and Navy established academies to

educate their officer corps and then a series of continuing education type schools to provide training and education to ensure their respective missions. The Marine Corps was not as large as the Army or Navy and could not justify an academy; however, the Marine Corps did receive graduates of both Service academies as commissioned Marine Corps second lieutenants. The formal schools did serve the function as the continuing training and education for Marines and their unique mission.

Two additional activities were organized as a part of the Marine Corps Schools: the Correspondence Courses and the Department of Reproduction. The Correspondence Courses, not a part of M.C.I., was located at Quantico and courses were developed for Marine Corps Reserve officers to receive theoretical military instruction. The educational media of correspondence courses was most appropriate for the intended Marine students considering the expeditionary nature of the Marine Corps. The Department of Reproduction was basically a print plant. From a one hand-operated machine, it expanded to a large print plant. It was responsible for producing the Correspondence Courses and other Marine Corps Schools' educational materials as well as all Post printing.[10]

There was one other formal Marine Corps school located at Norfolk, Virginia, the School for Service Afloat. This school trained designated officers and enlisted Marines in the planning, training, and inspection of personnel, supplies, and equipment to be embarked aboard Navy ships. This was another integral part of the formal schools program for the training and education of the Marine Corps' mission.[11]

The Marine Corps Library, also established in 1920, was only a collection without indexes, reference files, or bibliographies. As the library grew during the 1920's, it became an important adjunct of the Marine Corps Schools. The library had accumulated enough volumes to provide substantial assistance to instructors and students by the mid-1930's. Because of the advanced base force concept and its amphibious operations orientation emphasized by the Marine Corps Schools, the library began to represent one of the greatest sources for printed material on the development and history of this particular type of warfare.[12]

The formal schools initially utilized Army methods, material, and curriculum and based their instruction on Army publications, organizations, and equipment. When the schools expanded in size they also began to depart from Army influence and produced their own data on amphibious

operations from reports of Fleet landing exercises, historical research, and the efforts of the Marine Corps Schools. The system of instruction was criticized by senior Marine officers in the pages of the Marine Corps Gazette as too rigid and without independent thinking.[13]

Under the leadership of Brigadier General Randolf C. Berkeley in 1930, the first general officer assigned as commander of the Marine Corps Schools, many radical changes in curriculum and methods of instruction were introduced. In 1931, the curriculum began to move further away from the Army curriculum and materials. The new curriculum of the schools emphasized Marine Corps organization, equipment, and amphibious operations. The methods and exercises employed under Berkeley included lecture, conference, conference problem, map exercise, map problem, map maneuver, terrain exercise, tactical walk, historical ride, and practical exercise.[14] In 1933, the Fleet Marine Force was established to project the amphibious mission of the Marine Corps.

In 1934 the Tentative Manual for Landing Operations was published to provide a doctrinal manual on amphibious operations. Manuals were the Marine Corps' Service-level directives to govern a particular policy or program. This particular manual was the basis for much of the curriculum of the formal schools. The manual, periodically improved,

was republished in 1938 as a Navy-Marine Corps publication Fleet Tactical Publication 167. This became the manual that guided the U.S. forces on many Pacific beaches in World War II.[15]

Another important manual developed in 1935 at the Marine Corps Schools for Marine Corps education and training was the Manual for Small Wars. Brigadier General Thomas Holcomb, Commanding Officer of the Schools, placed emphasis on the tactics and techniques of landing operations and approved a new manual to be used as a text in this area: The Manual for the Defense of Advanced Bases.[16] This manual legitimized the new mission for the Marine Corps, and the succinct actions of Marines during World War II validated the training and education efforts of the Marine Corps Schools of the 1920's and 1930's.

The Army and Navy operated professional military education (PME) type schools before World War II. The distribution of placements for Marine Corps officer students provided by other Services to professional education was adequate. The Marine Corps had access to the schools and colleges of the Army and Navy as well as recruits from the Naval Academy and from colleges where military instruction was performed by Army officers. Prior to World War II the Marine Corps was indebted to her sister Services for much of

the formal military training and education of its officers.[17] See Table 1 in Appendix C for the 1922 distribution of Marine Corps officers in the PME schools.

The Marine Corps Schools were established to be a continuous education process for the professional development of officers within the Marine Corps. The sundry post schools and M.C.I. as well as the Marine Corps School's regular and special classes and courses were offered to assist officers in their development and to prepare them for command, staff and special details that may be assigned during their careers.[18]

CONTINUING GENERAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR MARINES: M.C.I. OPERATION, 1920-1940

Marine Corps formal schools for mission oriented training and education were established as a requirement for the expansion, modernization, and professionalization of the Marine Corps and paralleled similar developments of the two other larger Services. General education activities were also established to respond to requirements and needs of Marines and the Marine Corps and also followed a parallel development process. John A. Lejeune had enough foresight to consolidate all training and education into a synergistic

effort from the Service headquarters level and institutionalize these efforts.

The vocational schools at Quantico in 1920 evolved into the Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.) and was the first sustained general education activity in the Marine Corps. M.C.I. provided education opportunities for those Marine who desired them and training and education efforts also developed skills needed for the advance base force concept. These efforts abetted the Marine Corps in refining its mission and stabilizing its growth between the wars with a peace time force of more than 16,000.

M.C.I. entered an era of relative calm during the next twenty years. After the relocation to Washington, M.C.I. had initial growth that stabilized in the late 1920's. M.C.I. continued to advertise the courses available and emphasize the many benefits Marines could enjoy.

Lieutenant Colonel Harllee began directing M.C.I. from Washington in November 1920 and by December had initiated a catalog of courses.[19] He continued to steer the institution while always looking for means to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of M.C.I. He personally requested specific individuals or particular sections of units to improve courses or create the basis for new courses to further improve M.C.I.[20]

In its annual report to the Navy Department for 1920, the Marine Corps presented the development and basic philosophy of M.C.I. The report noted that vocational and educational training opportunities prior to the establishment of M.C.I. were limited to skills related to the performance of military duties. The report pointed out that education and training for other than military skills was sporadic, consisting of unrelated efforts at some posts, none at others, and some related to technical military skills. M.C.I. now offered opportunities for Marines to improve themselves and prepare them for civilian life. The report justified the correspondence method of instruction as the most efficient method and most appropriate because of the organization, locations, and operational considerations of the Marine Corps. The report indicated a continuing thematic characteristic of M.C.I.'s philosophy: vocational and educational training offered on a voluntary basis from a large variety of courses enabling individual Marines to select courses related to their experiences for the purpose of self-improvement.[21]

M.C.I. continued as primarily a correspondence school to provide general education for Marines on a voluntary basis. In 1921 M.C.I. took over all extra-military

education provided to Marines that was not directly supporting Marine Corps mission oriented training.[22]

Secretary Daniels maintained his hearty support and praised M.C.I. emphasizing the basic philosophy of the institution.[23] He noted that one of the principal purposes is to give a common school education to every man who enlists in the Marine Corps.[24] This was exactly what Daniels had intended to do with his Navy University concept of 1913.

M.C.I. Evolves 1922-1930

M.C.I,. primarily a correspondence school, provided general education and all other extra-military education not directly supporting Marine Corps mission oriented training. The continuing evolution of the mission, growth, modernization, and professionalization of the Marine Corps forced M.C.I. to evolve its mission.[25]

M.C.I. reinstituted classroom instruction when the Clerical Schools Detachment was established at Marine Barracks in Washington in 1922-1923. As a resident clerical school for stenographers and clerks at the barracks, the school provided classroom instruction in clerical subjects until enough clerks had been trained.[26]

Another deviation from M.C.I.'s philosophy of voluntary participation was the directive of Commandant Lejeune in 1923 to require all company grade officers to enroll in the M.C.I. Bookkeeping Course. Lejeune believed many officers at times were required to maintain or audit accounts and the course would be of great benefit to the younger officers and the Marine Corps in general.[27] Again in 1924, Lejeune ordered all officers to enroll in a foreign language course from M.C.I.[28] This required M.C.I. to prepare examinations in French and Spanish for those officers not already qualified in these languages.[29]

In 1925 M.C.I. established the Warrant Officers Preparatory Course for those Marines desiring to matriculate into the newly created rank structure. The course of instruction included arithmetic, spelling, English grammar and composition, punctuation and capitalization, geography, and U.S. history. The course of instruction provided the prerequisites for Marines to complete the Warrant Officer School's training. A diploma was awarded upon successful completion of the entire course.[30]

Another development occurred in 1928 when M.C.I. established a new department to conduct liaison between M.C.I. and leading commercial and industrial concerns throughout the United States.[31] The purpose of the liaison

was to explain to prospective civilian employers the nature and scope of M.C.I. and the poor opportunity for employment that normally confronted discharged Marines. M.C.I. believed the liaison department could help Marines obtain employment after discharge by assisting them to obtain interviews with employers contacted by M.C.I. Any Marine who had successfully completed a M.C.I. course could obtain an interview with a "card of introduction" provided by M.C.I. Additionally, M.C.I. furnished a list of all cooperating employers.[32]

M.C.I. had an opportunity to act as a role model for a general education activity for another Service in 1928. The United States Coast Guard began to study various educational methods in 1928 for the purpose of identifying a system that could enlarge their scope of training. The Coast Guard had provided service-related training courses to their men similar to the courses used in the Navy, but now they wanted to offer more general education opportunities to their men. Several Coast Guardsmen were transferred to M.C.I. to study the Marine Corps' system in order to establish a Coast Guard correspondence school upon their return. The Coast Guard Institute was established in 1929. An agreement with the Marine Corps allowed about 500 Coast Guardsmen to enroll in M.C.I. courses.[33]

In 1929 M.C.I. established a complete high school program. The "Standard High School Course" offered a program for four full years of high school study. M.C.I. provided a certificate upon successful completion of every credit unit.[34] This was the first effort by the Marine Corps in equivalency education.

The remainder of the decade following 1922 encountered the evolution of the Washington-based M.C.I. toward an institutional correspondence school that was a mirror-image of I.C.S. in operation. M.C.I. courses were offered to Marines, their dependents, and the Navy personnel assigned to Marine units. M.C.I. had grown to 166 courses with a separate academic department providing general education courses. Although M.C.I. peaked enrollment peaked between 1924 and 1926 with 8200, the activity and completion did not follow the enthusiasm and rate of enrollment.[35]

M.C.I. Stabilizes: 1930-1940

During the 1930's M.C.I. was not as dynamic as in its first decade. The 1930's was a period of stability and standardization for M.C.I. Enrollments, although below the previous decade, maintained a level between four and five thousand students. The process of examination, course

completion certification, and issuance of diplomas became institutionalized.[36] During this period many new courses were added and the staff was more than doubled.

During the 1930's the Academic school provided thirteen specific general education courses. These courses included: Second Lieutenant preparation, High school math, Warrant Officer's preparation, Grade school subjects, Standard high school, Naval academy preparation, Selected high school subjects, Good English, First lesson in English, College Algebra, Plane and spherical trigonometry, Analytical geometry, and First year college English. The Marine Corps selected the courses but they were written and maintained by I.C.S. There was no apparent need for high school completion courses during this period.[37]

The instructor staff of M.C.I. became more stable in the 1930's and were operating the six school divisions: academic, civil service, commercial, engineering, industrial, and language. These separate correspondence schools operated in a mirror image of I.C.S. The head of every school was a principal, the instruction was supervised by inspectors, and the instructors, the backbone of the institute, knew all aspects of the courses they instructed.

The mechanics of the schools' operations were identical to those of I.C.S. and the Marine Corps was comfortable with

a standardized process for providing general education for all Marines, wherever they were stationed. Courses offered provided self-improvement, preparation for civilian life, and/or advancement in rank. By 1938 M.C.I.'s infrastructure staff had stabilized at ninety-seven.[38] M.C.I. was not significantly altered during the decade.

M.C.I. SHIFTS ITS MISSION DURING WORLD WAR II

Prior to and during World War II general education in the Marine Corps continued its growth and popularity by persistent adaptation to need. M.C.I. increased the number of degreed instructors, began developing autonomous courses, received A.C.E. accreditation for some courses, developed prospective employer liaison programs, and moved toward independence from International Correspondence Schools. M.C.I. increased the numbers of courses, adopted a high school completion program, and began providing college accredited courses that provided opportunities affirming its basic philosophy: provide every Marine an opportunity to obtain an education.

In July 1940 prior to the United States involvement in the widening World War, the Commandant directed M.C.I. to establish a contingency plan for its activities to be

suspended in the event of war.[39] The contingency planning favored all Marines to be ordered to combat duty and only direct mission oriented training be maintained during the duration of the war. On December 8, 1941 all operations of M.C.I. were suspended and 68 of the 108 M.C.I. staff were ordered to recruiting duty. On January 12, 1942, the Director of M.C.I. recommended that M.C.I. be reopened because of its capability to provide education and training to Marines during the war. The recommendation was approved and M.C.I. reopened, manned by a skeleton crew to be augmented by 38 highly qualified recruits from the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina. M.C.I. was providing services by the end of January, 1942.[40]

In 1942 M.C.I. studied how to broaden its scope and accommodate the expected increased demand for services as the Marine Corps began to recruit for the war effort. Academic and vocational type courses continued in 1942 and were complemented by courses that supported requirements for warfighting skills training for Marines. Additional "special short courses" designed to compliment the resident military occupational specialty (MOS) and other skills training were established at many training locations. Courses were also being developed to provide background information on the practical illustrations used in MOS type

training such as diesel engines for MOS's dealing with heavy trucks.[41]

The rapid growth in the popularity of M.C.I. courses by new recruits for the war required increasing the M.C.I. staff. M.C.I. was initially authorized a staff of 48 Marines in January 1942; however, the staff increased to an authorized strength of 97 Marines by June 1943, still below the pre-War staffing level of 104 Marines.[42] By the summer of 1944 over 26,000 Marines were actively enrolled in M.C.I. courses with enrollment applications exceeding 2,000 a month.[43] Commandant A. A. Vandergrift authorized the addition of one Woman Marine Reserve Second Lieutenant and 20 enlisted Women Marine Reserves to M.C.I. in December 1943 to augment personnel requirements.[44] These additional Marines were primarily employed in the administration of the courses rather than curricula development.

Another initiative of M.C.I. during the early years of World War II to fill additional staff position at M.C.I. was the canvasing of Marines with educational backgrounds to fill the staff positions within M.C.I. This development of an instructional staff took time and some assistance of International Correspondence Schools (I.C.S.) was required between 1942 and 1944.[45]

To assist in publicizing the M.C.I. the Marine Corps required the Commanding Officers of sundry posts and stations to assign Education Officers to make M.C.I. opportunities known to Marines and provide other officers to administer final examinations in M.C.I. courses.

New Directions: High School Completion Programs

The most popular request in 1943 was for a program designed to help Marines complete high school course requirements and obtain a diploma. Many of the Marine recruits had their high school education interrupted. Obtaining high school completion not only aided Marines to obtain promotion but also helped raise the general education level of the individual.[46] To meet the demand, M.C.I. set out to enlist the cooperation of high school principals in each state and I.C.S. Initially I.C.S. provided standard courses of study, texts and lessons, and advice on policies for administering high school programs. Gradually the I.C.S. provided more curricula to M.C.I. The programs offered included College Preparatory Course, General Program, and Commercial Program that the student had a choice. Texts and lessons were free of charge with the condition that the student must complete the course in order

to keep the text. For example, in the English course, the texts included a dictionary that was provided to the student and could be kept only upon completion of the course.[47]

The Marine Corps accepted the completion of High School General Education Development (GED) tests as the equivalent of a high school education. The GED, developed by the University of Chicago in 1943, was a battery of five tests. The recognition of the GED provided Marines who had not completed formal high school courses required for a diploma an alternative means to satisfy the requirements for an equivalent diploma.[48]

M.C.I. began to work closely with the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) in 1943.[49] This will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. The American Council on Education (ACE) approved and sponsored a plan for universal accreditation of courses offered by both M.C.I. and USAFI. Under this plan M.C.I. was able to employ USAFI courses for a high school completion program for Marines that was fully accredited.[50]

One problem that had to be overcome was lead time consumed by mailings of the course work and developing a program of study for each enrolled Marine. The newly formed Guidance Section dispatched a form letter to the Marine's high school requesting the principal of that school provide

a transcript of the Marine's earned credits. Upon receiving the answer, the Guidance Section would outline a program of study, and M.C.I. would then forward the Marine his first text and lesson enabling the Marine to begin work to gain a high school diploma. Even this system proved impractical because of the time involved requesting information about the Marine student. The program was modified to permit the Guidance Section to base initial courses on the Marine's statement of experience. By the time all information and transcript were received the student was involved in a flexible program of study that could be adjusted if necessary. This policy proved to be more efficient.[51]

Expansion and Independence

A major change in the goals and operations of M.C.I. occurred in 1944 with the assignment of Colonel Donald J. Kendall as the Commanding Officer of Marine Barracks Washington D.C.[52] M.C.I. was reorganized to operate two separate schools: the Preparatory School and the Industrial School. The Preparatory School included the high school completion programs and courses. The Industrial School included the technical, industrial, and commercial courses.[53] Kendall had been interested in M.C.I. ever since

his days at Quantico in 1920 and his tenure ushered in a period of expansion for M.C.I.

Kendall set many goals for M.C.I. to accomplish. One of the most important of these goals was independence from I.C.S. and the development of autonomous M.C.I. courses. Courses would be developed by and for Marines to ensure optimum effectiveness of the M.C.I. courses.

M.C.I. had always provided opportunities for Marines to improve themselves through voluntary education. Kendall wanted to emphasize a more responsive, efficient, effective, and autonomous educational institution for Marine students. To accomplish a more responsive and efficient institution would require an M.C.I. branch in the Pacific area to provide prompt administrative service for the duration of the war. Kendall wanted M.C.I. course material to better meet the needs of the Marines but favorably compare to the quality of the I.C.S. lessons. Acquiring more and better qualified Marine instructors and offering a greater range of subjects would bring more effective and autonomous courses to M.C.I. Researching a program of college studies and securing M.C.I. course accreditation with A.C.E. to ensure validity would help increase the range of subjects of M.C.I.[54]

M.C.I. reorganized to meet the requirement of producing their own course material and established three new departments: research, editorial, and reproduction. The newly established departments provided M.C.I. the resources to create, revise, and maintain new courses and print their own course materials.[55]

M.C.I. courses were rewritten by Marines under Kendall's guidance. M.C.I. surveyed Marines for college degrees, college training, or teaching experience. These Marines were identified as potential M.C.I. course writers and developers.

Improving the courses included administrative improvements of the correspondence process. The lessons were also modified to provide ample space for answering questions or working through assigned problems to ease the paper requirement of the students. Questionnaires were devised so they were more understandable at the first reading. In some courses supplemental information was provided on the lesson sheets to make up for the deficiencies of the one-text per course system.

Course writers were selected accordingly to qualifications and expertise in the course subject area. They were given autonomy in course development to include choosing the textbook best suited to the subject and

Marines. Their proposed textbooks were submitted to the Director of the M.C.I. who gave final approval of textbooks before the course writer began developing the course. A course followed a path from the course writer through the departments with iterative Director approvals until the course material was published. As a result, the process proved successful and the American Council of Education's The Tuttle Handbook recommended that colleges and high schools give credit for a student's successful completion of the M.C.I. courses listed.[56] Kendall reached his goal of more courses of higher quality.

By 1945 Kendall had accomplished the goal of better qualified instructors. He could boast of a complement of personnel including three PhD's and more than a dozen men with M.A. degrees. This trend continued and by 1947 "more than 80% of the instructors were men with college degrees, qualifying them for expert instruction in their particular fields of education."[57] Many of the college graduate instructors possessed previous classroom experience as well. Women instructors with education backgrounds were especially chosen for M.C.I. There was some inimical attitudes toward the women instructors; however, the women did an excellent service in the important work grading papers, and were gradually accepted.[58]

One major objective of M.C.I. was to provide Marines an opportunity to complete their high school education. Kendall established a plan differing from the 1942 M.C.I. policy by formulating agreements with high school principals to allow Marine students to use M.C.I. credits to supplement previously earned high school credits to fulfil the requirements for a high school diploma. Marines in this new program were granted diplomas from their home town high school. A larger Guidance Section was established to accomplish Kendall's innovative program. The enlarged Guidance Section contacted school principals, investigated graduation requirements, requested and validated transcripts of previously earned credits, and outlined plans of study for each Marine in the program. Once the M.C.I. courses were completed a transcript was forwarded to the Marine's high school principal and the diploma awarded. This program supported 51% of M.C.I.'s students participating in this program.[59]

The Pacific Branch

Based on predictions of a longer war (two to five more years), planning began in September 1944 to better support the Pacific Theater Marines. The planning was completed in

March 1945 and the field desks, textbooks, student file cards, case records, and other accouterments of education left Washington for Norfolk, Virginia in a railroad boxcar. From Norfolk, the M.C.I. Pacific branch was to move via surface ships through the Panama Canal and on to Hawaii.[60]

Lieutenant Colonel Clarence L. Jordan was assigned as the Commanding Officer of the new Pacific branch. Upon receipt of the equipment and supplies from Washington, Jordan set the machinery in motion to reduce the correspondence time for the Marine students in the Pacific Theater. With 50% of the M.C.I. students located in the Pacific, the new branch was equipped to enroll students, distribute textbooks and lessons, and grade all lessons. Any student lesson received in Washington with a return address indicating assignment in the Pacific theater required that a new student file card and case record for that Marine be forwarded to Hawaii. The final examinations, however, were still sent to Washington for final correction and grading. By May 1945, the branch was in full operation.[61]

In 1945 the American Council on Education established the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) for the purpose of analyzing and evaluating educational experiences in the various branches of the Armed

Forces to include the Marine Corps. The studies of CASE resulted in a publication, A Guide of the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Forces, the recommendations that have since provided civilian secondary schools and colleges throughout the United States with a basis for evaluation of formalized training in the military Service, including M.C.I. and USAFI courses and tests. This War Department policy supported CASE financially in order that the Service, including Marines, would have the opportunity of obtaining academic credit for their military training.[62]

In February 1945, the Commandant of the Marine Corps activated the Education Section as a part of the Special Services Branch within the Headquarters. As a part of this action, every command within the Marine Corps was directed to establish a position for an Education Officer. The Education Officer's responsibility was to provide the means for education to those Marines who wanted it. The plan was to have centralized coordination for all educational programs from the Headquarters through a logical chain of command.[63]

M.C.I. had achieved unprecedented growth by the end of the War. M.C.I. enrollments exceeded 7,000 in 1942 and grew to more than 63,000 at the War's end.[64] Several factors

influenced M.C.I.'s growth: the addition of new programs, the wide range of subjects, allowing Marines to continue M.C.I. courses after discharge, and the excellent quality of study materials and textbooks provided by M.C.I. at no charge.[65] Most of Kendall's goals were reached.

POST-WORLD WAR II M.C.I.: DOWNSIZING AND REFORMS

The end of World War II meant downsizing for the entire Marine Corps and M.C.I. was not excluded. The M.C.I. program in the Pacific theater branch was greatly reduced after the War as Marines were redeployed back to the United States. The Pacific branch was disbanded in 1946 and the personnel transferred to Washington.[66] The demobilization following World War II had begun to decimate the entire M.C.I. staff. By August 1946 all women Marines had been discharged and by September 1946 all Marine Corps reserves had been discharged. The rate of course activity fell off proportionately.[67] Kendall, always looking to the future, established a plan to replace some of the Marine vacancies with civil service personnel through the Navy Department and Civil Service Commission. Many civilian positions were opened to support M.C.I. during World War II and their contributions were very productive.

In the immediate post-War period, M.C.I. established new criteria for choosing Marine instructors and improved the instructor training program. The new criteria required instructors to be a high school graduate, have a score of 110 or higher on the General Classification Test (GCT), and have some college credits in order to be assigned to college courses. The training program was improved in an attempt to enhance the quality of instruction.[68] The new program required civilian "staff instructors," as they were titled, to revise old courses, write new courses, supervise instructors, develop better methods of instruction, and be accountable for the quality of instruction. As a result of this major criteria adjustment and improved training, courses were improved and more responsive to the needs of the Marines and the Marine Corps.

M.C.I. also established a program of college-level courses in 1946. M.C.I. did not offer a college completion program comparable to the high school completion plan; however, it did offer a complete program of study for the first year of college. The college program served three purposes: first, it provided a Marine an opportunity to increase his general knowledge; second, it provided a Marine the opportunity to earn advanced college credit; and last, it provided a prospective officer the opportunity to earn

the required college credit needed for the officer training program. Although a Marine could enroll in any college-level course regardless of educational history, M.C.I. policy dictated that only high school graduates could enroll in college-level courses for college credit.[69]

In early 1948, M.C.I. began the distribution of a handbook containing a listing of all M.C.I. courses. This first M.C.I. handbook contained a brief description of all courses, information on enrollment, and course requirements of each of the 203 courses offered.[70] The handbook provided more information for the individual Marine to choose courses of interest.

SUMMARY

From 1920 through the depression to the beginning of World War II was a period of stabilization for M.C.I. and Marine Corps general education. During the War M.C.I. started to align its mission with new tasks mandated by the requirements and needs of the multitude of wartime Marines.

M.C.I. in 1920 was primarily a correspondence school, provided general education and all other extra-military education not directly supporting Marine Corps mission oriented training. The continuing evolution of the mission,

growth, modernization, and professionalization of the Marine Corps forced M.C.I. to evolve its mission.

M.C.I. deviated and reinstituted classroom instruction when the Clerical Schools Detachment was established at Marine Barracks in Washington in 1922-1923. Another deviation was non-voluntary participation in 1923 when all company grade officers were required to enroll in a M.C.I. bookkeeping course. Again in 1924, all officers were enrolled in a foreign language course (French and Spanish). In 1925 the Warrant Officers Preparatory Course for those Marines desiring to matriculate into the newly created rank structure were required to enroll prerequisites in arithmetic, spelling, English grammar and composition, punctuation and capitalization, geography, and U.S. history. Another development occurred in 1928 when M.C.I. established a new department to conduct liaison between M.C.I. and leading commercial and industrial concerns throughout the United States. The purpose of the liaison was to explain to prospective civilian employers the nature and scope of M.C.I. and the poor opportunity for employment that normally confronted discharged Marines.

M.C.I. had an opportunity to act as a role model for a general education activity for another Service in 1928. The United States Coast Guard began to study various educational

methods in 1928 for the purpose of identifying a system that could enlarge their scope of training. The Coast Guard had provided service-related training courses to their men similar to the courses used in the Navy, but now they wanted to offer more general education opportunities to their men.

In 1929 M.C.I. established a complete high school program. The "Standard High School Course" offered a program for four full years of high school study. This was the first effort by the Marine Corps in equivalency education.

During the 1930's M.C.I. was not as dynamic as in its first decade. The 1930's was a period of stability and standardization with enrollments were maintained between four and five thousand students. The process of examination, course completion certification, and issuance of diplomas became institutionalized and many new courses were added and the staff was more than doubled. M.C.I. was not significantly altered during the decade.

In July 1940 prior to the United States involvement in the widening World War, the Commandant directed M.C.I. to establish a contingency plan favoring all Marines to be ordered to combat duty and only direct mission oriented training be maintained during the duration of the war. On December 8, 1941 all operations of M.C.I. were suspended.

M.C.I. was again providing services by the end of January, 1942. It broadened its scope to accommodate the expected increased demand from recruitment for the war effort and complementing courses that supported requirements for warfighting skills training.

M.C.I.'s general education courses developed into a graduating hierarchy of relating subjects. M.C.I. continued to provide general education and mission oriented training and education to Marines following World War II. As the Marine Corps was downsizing, the activity of M.C.I. also was reduced. M.C.I. continued to focus on the changing needs of individual Marines and the Corps with high quality and responsive courses.

The years from 1920-1948 were also a period of refinement for Marine Corps general education programs. Lejeune's aspiration to educate Marine Corps officers in a complete curriculum of well rounded courses initiated the Field Officers' School, Company Grade School, and Basic School. These schools and their specialist curriculum complimented M.C.I. and extended Lejeune's philosophy of offering every Marine an opportunity for an education. The curricula of these schools progressed from the Army's training programs and I.C.S.'s commercial courses to

specific Marine Corps courses for professional military education and general education.

Philosophies and visions of individuals such as Daniels and Lejeune inspired and guided the Marine Corps training and education programs. Loyal support and execution by other influential leaders such as Harllee in the 1920's-30's and Kendall in the 1940's substantiated the program's value and confirmed its practice. Prior to and during World War II general education in the Marine Corps continued its growth and popularity, by persistent adaptation to need. M.C.I. increased the number of degreed instructors, began developing autonomous courses, received A.C.E. accreditation for some courses, developed prospective employer liaison programs, and moved toward independence from International Correspondence Schools. M.C.I. also increased the numbers of courses, adopted a high school completion program, and began providing college accredited courses. All of these courses provided opportunities affirming its basic philosophy: provide every Marine an opportunity to obtain an education.

NOTES

1. "The Quantico Schools," Marine Corps Gazette, September, 1920, 316.

2. Ibid and "The Development of MCS," Marine Corps Gazette, September, 1954, 36-38, Bernard E. Trainor, A History of the US Marines, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1981), 23, B. E. Trainor, "A History of Marine Corps School," Text of a Speech, Delivered on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Post Quantico, Virginia, 13 May 1967, 1-4. On May 14, 1917 four Marine officers and 91 enlisted Marines commanded by Major Chandler Campbell established Marine Barracks, Quantico. The Quantico Leatherneck began publication in October 1917. In its first issue it proclaimed approximately $250,000 is being spent at Quantico by the government in constructing some of the finest concrete roads in Virginia. In all, eight miles of roadway are being paved. Perhaps the greatest achievement is the building of a concrete road, three and a half miles long, from the head of Potomac Avenue at the river, to Washington to Richmond highway. It is a much favored road for hikes. Quantico soon will be no more known as: Slippery Mud, Virginia. However, the School of Application, which was re-opened following the Spanish American War, was the original Marine Corps institutionalized school for officer training in Washington, D.C. Beginning in 1903 the School of Application was moved to Annapolis, Maryland, but closed again in 1907 because of Marine Corps deployments to Panama and Cuba. In 1908 the school was re-opened in Port Royal, South Carolina, where the name was changed to Marine Officers' School. In 1910 the school was moved to Norfolk, Virginia. From 1912 to 1919 the school's activity was very limited because many Marine Corps officers were deployed to Nicaragua and Haiti as well as the war in Europe. There was another obscure Marine Corps officer school in Newport, Connecticut in 1910 that provided officers the opportunity to methodically study the problems of its new mission by planning operations involved in securing and defending advanced bases.

3. Leatherneck, October 1919.

4. Marine Barracks, Quantico, (Washington; U.S. Marine Corps, 1930), 32, "Officers School at Quantico," Marine Corps Gazette, March, 1920, 113-115, "The Marine Corps

Schools," Marine Corps Gazette, December, 1920, 407, and Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy for the Fiscal Year 1920, 1071.

5. "The Development of MCS," 38 and Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy for the Fiscal Year 1920, 1071.

6. "Military Schooling in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, March 1922, 23-24.

7. Ibid.

8. Dion Williams, "The Education of A Marine Officer," Marine Corps Gazette, August, 1933, 17.

9. "Military Education in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, June 1921, 230, Jesse F. Dyer, "Military Schooling in the Marine Corps," 23, and Marine Barracks, Quantico, (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1930), 32, and Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy for the Fiscal Year 1920, (Washington: United States Navy Department, 1920), 1071.

10. Marine Barracks, Quantico, 50 and R. H. Dunlap, "Education in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, July, 1921, 153.

11. Ibid, 154.

12. "The Development of MCS," 50.

13. Anthony Frances, A History of the Marine Corps Schools, Unpublished thesis of 1945, 53-55. The books accumulated in the early years of the Schools were primarily donations from the solicitations of individuals and organizations.

14. "Military Schooling in the Marine Corps," 24.

15. "The Development of MCS," 38.

16. Ibid, 38-39.

17. Frances, 55.

18. "Officers Schools at Quantico," 113.

19. "Military Schooling in the Marine Corps," 22, 24-26. Major General Lejeune's policy relating to the military education of commissioned officers was outlined in several Marine Corps Orders. His policy required every officer to possess a basic education, which he believed would prepare the officer to function efficiently within a Marine command as either a line or staff officer. This requirement for a basic general education was the basis of the first objective. Lejeune's other objectives related to the progressive professional development of Marine officers. The other objectives also coincided with the progressive developmental design of the Marine Corps Schools. The only exception to the objectives was the advice that second lieutenants should not attempt to specialize except in aviation. This exception was disregarded after World War II when the concept of MOS professional/specialized training and education was to commence after the Basic School.

20. Official Letter from Lieutenant Colonel William Harllee to Brigadier S. D. Butler, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., December 2, 1920.

21. Ibid, 2. Harllee learned that a detail of about twelve officers and fifty enlisted Marines that were returning from France. He had over 40 vacancies in the M.C.I. Detachment and wanted to fill with the best available Marines. Lieutenants Montague and Wellman had been recommended to be suitable to develop a Map Detachment and associated courses.

22. Annual Report to the Navy Department, 1020-1022.

23. Ben McKawley, "Studying on the Land and Sea," Trained Men, March-April, 1922, 65-72.

24. McKawley, 62-72.

25. Draft of "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation," Joseph Daniels Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

26. "Marine Corps Institute Clerical Schools Detachment," The Leatherneck, January 13, 1923, 1.

27. "All Company Officers To Take MCI Courses," The Leatherneck, March 17, 1923, 1. Company grade officers included the ranks of second lieutenant, first lieutenant,

and captain.

28. John Harllee, The Marine From Manatee: A Tradition of Rifle Marksmanship, (Washington: National Rifle Association of America, 1984, 247.

29. "Examinations in Language Courses," The Leatherneck, February 7, 1925, 12. ICS did not give examinations in their foreign language courses and M.C.I. had to create their final examinations independently. This was the first M.C.I. final examination.

30. "Warrant Officer Preparatory Course," The Leatherneck, February 7, 1925, 12.

31. "MCI Establishes Contact with Employers for Institute Graduate," The Leatherneck, July, 1928, 33.

32. Ibid.

33. "The U.S. Coast Guard and Education," The Leatherneck, December, 1928, 10.

34. "Complete High School Education Offered," The Leatherneck, July 1928, 29.

35. Thomas H. Flood The United States Marine Corps Institute Since 1938, Thesis, 1948, 4.

36. Flood, 6.

37. Gaynor Pearson, The United States Marine Corps Institute, Thesis, 1938, Table IV.

38. Marine Corps Manual, (Washington: U.S. Marine Corps, 1931), 118. When a student satisfactorily completes a course in the Marine Corps Institute a diploma or certificate will be awarded and transmitted to the student via his commanding officer, by the director. The commanding officer will make an appropriate entry in the service-record book of the man concerned, showing course satisfactorily complete and date of completion. The presentation of a diploma should be an occasion of ceremony.

39. Official Letter, Major General Commandant to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (1520-30-80-10/A0-277-WRA/5 July, 1940), Subject: Operations Plan for Suspension

of the Marine Corps Institute.

40. Official Letter, Marine Corps Institute to Major General Commandant, (263/BP/emf/12 Jan 1942), regarding reopening of the M.C.I., Official Letter, Major General Commandant to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (2385/7-835/AO-277-pjd/19 Jan 1942), regarding reopening of the M.C.I., and Ruoff, 27.

41. "Postwar Pattern of A Marine," The Leatherneck, May, 1943, 50 and 53.

42. Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps, (Code A&I), to Director, Marine Corps Institute (2387/7-835/AD-31-1c/23 Jan 1942), Subject: Authorized allowance and Official Letter Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director Marine Corps Institute (Serial MC-80013/26 January 1943) regarding allowance of personnel.

43. Gerald Langford, "Even in a Foxhole," Marine Corps Gazette, June, 1944, 56.

44. Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (Serial MC-162034/9 December 1943), regarding assignment of Women Reserves.

45. Cyril O. Houle, The Armed Services and Adult Education, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947), 43.

46. Off-Duty Education Manual, U.S. Marine Corps, NAVMC 1143-PD, 28 February 1957, 1-2.

47. Langford, 52. The recognition by the Marine Corps, and the other Services, provided Marines, soldiers, and sailors who had not completed formal high school courses required for a diploma, an alternative means, by passing a battery of five tests, to satisfy the requirements for an equivalent diploma.

48. Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (Serial 151521/5 February 1943) regarding liaison with USAFI.
29. Langford, 53.

49. Robert M. Smith, G. F. Akers, J. R. Kidd, Handbook of Adult Education, (New York: The MacMillan Company,

1970), 287.

50. Langford, 53.

51. Ibid.

52. "Postwar Bulletin for Marines," 50-52 and Flood, 28-32.

53. Langford, 86.

54. Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (Serial MC-308924/2 September 1944), regarding Commandant of the Marine Corps approval of M.C.I. recommendations.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid.

57. A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Forces, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1945), 111.

58. L. F. Johnson, Jr., "The Globe Is Its Campus," The Leatherneck, February 1947, 26.

59. MC-162034/9 December 1943.

60. Hugh M. McIlroy, Jr., The history of the Marine Corps Institute, Thesis, 1986, 19.

61. Ruoff, 27 ad Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., Post Special Order No. 10-1945, 2 February 1945, regarding the Pacific Branch of M.C.I.

62. Ibid and Marine Corps Order 1560.8, Subj: Evaluation of Service training in terms of academic credit, 19 January 1957.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. Ruoff, 27.

66. Headquarters Bulletin No. 246, 11.

67. Ruoff, 27 and Special Order 10-1945.

68. McIlroy, 25.

CHAPTER VI

FROM GENERAL EDUCATION TO OFF-DUTY EDUCATION: 1948-1992

The Marine Corps continued to provide opportunities for individual Marine to attain academic and vocational education for professional development and preparation for the return to civilian life. Established programs after World War II provided opportunities for participating in vocational training, remedial and deficiency courses, academic and vocational high schools, post secondary training and college and university courses. This chapter will discuss three major aspects of the Marine Corps general education following World War II: M.C.I.'s competitive relationship with the United States Armed Forces Institute; the revision of M.C.I.'s mission; and the development of off-duty education programs.

THE MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE COMPETITIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INSTITUTE

While M.C.I. was relatively slow to develop as the Marine Corps' first stable general education activity, it had never been threatened from external forces prior to the end of World War II. With the establishment of the Office

of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) following World War II, efforts began to economize and reduce duplication in educational programs within the Services. In 1948, the Personnel Policy Board of OSD directed the Interservice Committee to convene and study the consolidation of the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) and M.C.I. The committee unanimously recommended not to consolidate the institutions. The Chief of the Armed Forces Information and Education Division, Department of Defense, General Harrison, however, did not concur with the committee report and recommended that the two institutions be consolidated. Harrison contended that USAFI accomplished the same tasks as M.C.I. but did it more economically.[1]

The OSD Military Personnel Policy Board referred this report to the Secretary of the Navy who then appointed a representative. The Navy's representative argued that M.C.I. was more economical to operate than USAFI and pointed out that the Marines assigned to M.C.I. performed collateral duties as a precision drill and ceremonial color guard at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. This would continue to be required even if M.C.I. was disbanded, and, therefore, no savings of personnel or pay and allowances would result if the two were consolidated. The Secretary of the Navy prevailed and M.C.I. continued operation.[2]

In 1950, another agency, the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces, known as the Weil Committee, stirred the controversy by reporting that M.C.I. and USAFI duplicated functions. However, that same year, the OSD Military Personnel Policy Committee convened a subcommittee on Statement of Policies and Principles within the Department of Defense and reported that the M.C.I. was a "training" activity of the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps has maintained since 1950 that M.C.I. is a "training" activity. This declaration was an effort to thwart any consideration of the consolidation of M.C.I. and USAFI, preclude any inspections of the operation of M.C.I. by an organization outside of the Marine Corps, or issuance of any directives by the Office of the Armed Forces Information and Education, Department of Defense, which could have impacted on the operation of M.C.I. and indirectly the Marine Corps.[3] The Marine Corps became defensive toward the mission of M.C.I. as it had with its own unique mission.

This perceived threat was significant because the Marine Corps began to reevaluate its policy toward general education and the purpose of M.C.I. Many actions resulted from the perceived threat: revised mission for M.C.I., general education programs and procedures, special education programs, and off-duty education policies. All of these

actions provided an identity for M.C.I. and enabled it to be autonomous within the Department of Defense.

M.C.I. REVISES ITS MISSION: FROM GENERAL EDUCATION TO MOS TRAINING AND EDUCATION

The Marine Corps began to change its general education policy in 1951 by shifting the emphasis of M.C.I. from general education to primarily training associated with military occupational specialties (MOS). USAFI expanded its programs to include virtually any course available in elementary and high schools, technical and vocational schools, and colleges through the first two years. The gap left by the decision to shift the M.C.I. emphasis was filled by USAFI since Marines were authorized to utilize USAFI programs. The transition of M.C.I. to MOS training was gradual.[4] Thus the Marine Corps began to change M.C.I.'s former guiding principal of providing general education for Marines preparing for return to civilian life to primarily assisting Marines to improvement of MOS training and proficiency and secondarily receive general education of an academic nature.

In 1953 the autonomy of M.C.I. was threatened again by proposed legislation, HR 2579, titled "To authorize the

furnishing of information and civilian education for personnel in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes." The Marine Corps believed the legislation would provide authority for the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education to regulate information and education programs within the military Services. The Director of M.C.I. expedited the transition of M.C.I.'s curriculum to non-tactical technical training type courses.[5] The Marine Corps also believed the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education wanted to direct the consolidation of USAFI and M.C.I. citing duplication, economy, and similar opportunities for all servicemen.[6]

The Marine Corps, sensing that M.C.I. was under siege, began revising the mission and improving the effectiveness of M.C.I. This siege mentality resulted in studies to evaluate training and education throughout the Marine Corps. The Testing and Education Unit of Marine Corps Schools at Quantico conducted a 1953 study to determine the effectiveness of promotion tests; however, the study indicated that the average knowledge level among all Marines was low. The study also indicated Marine Corps Unit Training and on-the-job-training (OJT) methods produced only minimum knowledge. The promotion of large numbers of Marines in certain MOS fields had permitted Marines with

only minimal knowledge to be promoted, further reducing the effectiveness of OJT. The Marine Corps concluded that the average knowledge of Marines should be raised and directed that M.C.I. design courses to better prepare individuals for technical tests.[7]

Following the study the Commandant of the Marine Corps in 1953 directed M.C.I. to change its mission statement to include providing "non-tactical correspondence instruction" to contribute to MOS proficiency of individual Marines. M.C.I. was also to address the average knowledge level among Marines while executing its new mission.[8] The Director of M.C.I. recommended changes in the Marine Corps Manual, dropping some courses, changing the scope of responsibility for non-tactical correspondence instruction, and modifying procedures for the preparation of M.C.I. courses.[9] As a result 29 courses in the Academic School were dropped while 60 courses in the Academic School and 33 courses in the Technical Schools were retained.[10]

M.C.I.'S New Mission

The new mission of M.C.I. resulted in a realignment toward military and technical training and a significant change in its three decade tradition of voluntary general

education. Issues of autonomy between the Marine Corps and the Office of the Armed Forces Information and Education in the Department of Defense precipitated the shift in mission. To further legitimize its identity, the official title of the Marine Corps Institute Detachment at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. was changed to the Marine Corps Institute during October 1954.[11] In 1956 the mission of M.C.I. was expanded to include development of all courses in all MOS's, both technical and tactical, to enable Marines to maintain and increase their technical proficiency and prepare for promotion.[12]

The Extension School at Quantico had previously offered tactical and general military subjects courses and M.C.I.'s mission expansion precipitated some duplication of effort. It became necessary to consolidate and clarify these efforts of tactical and general military subjects correspondence training. In 1959, the Commandant directed the transfer of all enlisted Marine training courses prepared by the Extension School to M.C.I. and the closing of the Extension School. All instructional materials, records, and administrative materials were also transferred to M.C.I.[13] Thus after 1959 academic and general education correspondence courses for Marines were available only through USAFI and off-duty education programs.

The Commandant directed that the Testing and Education Unit also be consolidated with M.C.I. in 1959. The consolidation of activities, specifically promotion examinations, improved the efficiency of the enlisted Marine training program. The personnel and equipment dedicated to the testing were also transferred to M.C.I.[14]

The mission of M.C.I. was revised in 1959, in 1960, and still again in 1961. The mission statement of 1961 required M.C.I. to contribute to the military proficiency of individual Marines and to prepare and process examinations as directed by the Commandant. The functions that guided M.C.I. through the 1960's included preparing and administering correspondence courses in technical and general military subjects; preparing, distributing, grading, evaluating, and reporting results of general military subjects tests; providing appropriate publicity and information materials to the Marine Corps concerning M.C.I. courses; preparing and providing testing materials and test results to commanders for evaluation of their own general military subjects training programs; and providing administrative and technical assistance in connection with officer examination programs.[15]

The transition of M.C.I. from general education to non-tactical courses was designated to increase the technical

and general military proficiency of Marines. From 1957 to 1964 the course completion rate increased from 29.2 percent to 45.3 percent while enrollments increased during the same period from 27,000 to 115,000.[16] Additionally, in late 1964 M.C.I. further increased efficiency by converting the former manual mechanical method of maintaining records to computer data processing. This automation enabled M.C.I. to provide reports to commands indicating enrollment and progress and more timely reserve retirement credit.[17]

In 1964 a study indicated that some duplication still existed between the Extension School and M.C.I. Liaison was directed by the Commandant to effect a smooth transition of courses and materials that were to be consolidated.[18] The consolidation and liaison continued through 1965.[19]

Over the next ten years M.C.I. continued to maintain and update the general military subjects program. In 1975 the name was changed to Essential Subjects Program and the first Essential Subjects Handbook was published. This handbook was distributed to every Marine providing a single source reference to aid Marines in preparation of the annual Essential Subjects Test. In 1976 this program was expanded to include performance-oriented training and testing.[20]

M.C.I.'s technical courses were accredited by the National Home Study Council in June 1977. Marines

completing M.C.I. technical courses could request high school or undergraduate colleges for credit where applicable.[21]

Enrollments in M.C.I. continued to grow and more efficient methods of operation were examined. The completion rate of students was low, less than half in the 1960's.[22] The Marine Corps was still very sensitive about autonomy over M.C.I. and challenged itself to improve completion rates of M.C.I. courses.[23] From 1970 to 1983 the Marine Corps-wide completion rate increased from below 65 percent to 91.02 percent.[24]

M.C.I. Continues to Meet Needs

As a result of the new M.C.I. mission, control shifted from Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. to the Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia in 1977. An in-house study was conducted to research the issue of the economy of resident and non-resident training programs in the Marine Corps. Emphasis was placed on the Professional Military Education (PME) courses that were designed for officer and staff non-commissioned officer development following the study. The results of the study also prompted a further consolidation

of the Extension School functions within M.C.I. In 1980 M.C.I. became responsible for all correspondence courses for training and education in the Marine Corps. The PME courses that were incorporated into M.C.I. included the Staff Non-Commissioned Officer, The Basic School, the Amphibious Warfare, and the Marine Corps Command and Staff College Non-resident Programs. The consolidation of the four programs with the 49 subcourses increased M.C.I. enrollment twenty percent to over 129,000 enrollments.[25]

Efficiency in operations was driven by Marine Corps budgetary constraints. The cost of mail and the problem of delays had plagued M.C.I. from its beginning. The reformatting of many of the courses to allow self-grading lessons (called nonreturnable lessons) resolved most of the problems. Nonreturnable lessons reduced the need to return lessons and final examination for grading as previously required. The new method required only returning the final examination at a cost and time savings to M.C.I. and the Marine student.[26]

Continuing growth rapidly saturated the shared computer time utilized by M.C.I. M.C.I. needed its own computer and this requirement for an autonomous computer system was satisfied in 1980.[27] M.C.I. continued to grow during the

1980's and continued to utilize computer automation for record keeping, grading, and production of reports.

In 1992 M.C.I. offered 180 courses that provided instruction and training in more than 21 occupational fields for the entire MOS structure of the Marine Corps. There are six non-resident PME programs that parallel the resident programs located at Quantico with 67 courses.[28] The 1992 M.C.I. catalogue describes M.C.I. as the official training activity of the Marine Corps responsible for preparing and administering nonresident training programs designed to increase the general military and technical proficiency of enlisted Marines. M.C.I. plans, develops, and administers non-resident professional programs paralleling those of the Marine Corps Combat Development Command resident schools and assists, as required, in providing nonresident professional education to Marine Corps reservists and reserve units. M.C.I. develops, prints, stocks, and distributes performance oriented lesson plans and performance tests to support the learning objectives and written tests for use by the Inspector General of the Marine Corps and unit commanders to measure proficiency in all essential subjects.[29]

M.C.I. continues to provide many benefits to Marines, enabling increased proficiency in MOS's, alternative opportunities to attend resident schools, opportunities to

earn composite score points for promotion, and earn high school and college credit. The emphasis is oriented toward the training and educating for the Marine's MOS and professional development.

DEVELOPING PROGRAMS AND PROCEDURES FOR OFF-DUTY EDUCATION: 1946-1975

As M.C.I. was compelled to change its mission from general education to MOS training and education, a new concept toward providing general education began to emerge throughout the Department of Defense (DOD). DOD-wide general education activities such as USAFI began to emerge during World War II. Off-duty general education opportunities became the alternative for Marines with general education needs provided by M.C.I. prior to the post-World War II era. In 1950 Congress began appropriating funding for the partial payment of tuition or expenses for off-duty education for all military personnel, thus expanding educational services. Tuition aid programs promoted off-duty education, made resident off-duty instruction programs possible, and provided payment of civilian instructors of off-duty classes established at posts and stations throughout the Marine Corps.[30] A survey

in 1951 indicated that twenty five per cent of the Marines sampled were involved in off-duty education.[31]

Improvements of off-duty educational facilities and services were needed at posts and stations throughout the Marine Corps. Officers and enlisted Marines assigned to the education offices were burdened with additional duties and were inadequately trained to properly maintain such programs. The Marine Corps delayed increasing personnel and training for off-duty educational facilities and directed a survey of all aspects of the off-duty education problems. The only improvement was the addition of one officer with an education background assigned to the Special Services Branch at Headquarters Marine Corps.[32]

The Marine Corps began looking at many off-duty programs available in the post World War II era to provide opportunities for Marines to satisfy their general education needs. In 1951 the College Level General Education Development tests consisting of four tests designed to measure the educational attainment of the college student at the end of his first year was recognized by the Marine Corps. A Marine could satisfy requirements for the freshman year of college by passing the tests.[33]

The Marine Corps also began seeking support for legislation to provide for a limited number of Marines the

opportunity to receive instruction at civilian institutions. The Marine Corps could not economically establish facilities, curricula, and instructors for the limited number requiring highly technical instruction in comptrollership, postgraduate personnel administration, postgraduate business administration, postgraduate electronic engineering, textile engineering, and civil engineering.[34] After graduation Marines were then to be placed in positions or billets to more effectively operate in those billets.

By late 1952 the Marine Corps began to experience increased pressure from the Department of Defense to establish off-duty educational and information programs in a particular manner. Where central control and direction of off-duty education should reside within the Marine Corps was questioned. The Headquarters Staff resolved the issue by arguing that general education and information was separate from military training and education. The central control and direction of off-duty education would continue to reside in the Special Services Branch at the Headquarters.[35]

MARINE CORPS DEVELOPS OFF-DUTY EDUCATION POLICIES

Public Law 416, an amendment to the National Security Act, passed by Congress in 1952, guaranteed the continued existence of the Marine Corps, specifying a Marine Corps comprised of not less than three combat divisions and three aircraft wings. The stability in the size of the Marine Corps facilitated stable policies and programs for off-duty education through the mid 1950's; however, there were still no improvement in training or personnel administrating the programs. By the mid 1950's Marine units were dispersed to posts and stations in Japan, California, and North Carolina. This world-wide dispersal of Marine units added more pressure to the program by creating more educational offices and specific program requirements.[36]

In 1955 the control of the tuition aid program funding was decentralized, permitting more liberal disbursements for off-duty education. Previously funds were held at major commands and their independent administrative requirements made off-duty education difficult to attain. Ceilings previously placed upon the amounts individual commands might spend to enroll their personnel were removed and expenditures of funds were authorized as necessary to fulfill applicant requirements. From 1954 to 1955, Marine

enrollments increased 464 percent with attendance in more than one hundred different colleges and universities and seven high schools. Ninety eight percent of the courses pursued were college and university level with 94.2 percent of the courses completed. In 1956 the tuition aid program continued to expand and Marines were authorized to enroll in any USAFI course.[37]

In 1957 the Marine Corps recommended that the Department of the Navy encourage institutions of higher learning to treat off-duty education with a more liberal viewpoint. These institutions should include off-campus instruction credit comparably with on-campus instruction and assist Marines to meet degree requirements without reduction of educational standards, such as residence requirements. Previously some institutions did not accept some off-campus courses for degree credit and seldom accepted off-campus course work in lieu of residence requirements. The Marine Corps also suggested the establishment of closer liaison with institutions of higher learning in recruitment and utilization of retired personnel for academic positions such as teachers.[38]

Guidance to Establish Off-Duty Education Programs

Improvements in the off-duty education services finally appeared with the publication of The Off-Duty Education Manual in 1957. It provided Education Officers and Education Assistants with information to organize, plan, supervise, and administer the off-duty education programs.[39] The manual further discussed counselling and testing required in the program.[40] The manual also attempted to distinguish between training and education, defining education as preparation for living a full life and training as preparation for useful work, essential, of course, to a full life.[41]

The Marine Corps encouraged education but required every Marine to be trained for their job. Marine Corps off-duty education programs were divided into two categories: training and education.

Within the off-duty training category were M.C.I. correspondence courses, Group Study Courses, and Extension Schools courses to enhance military and MOS proficiency for individual Marines or Marine Corps units. The M.C.I. correspondence courses complimented the training program of the formal technical schools to assist Marines to maintain and increase proficiency in their MOS, qualify for

promotion, and assist unit commanders in conducting on the job training in certain technical areas. Group Study Courses were organized for groups with an interest in a particular area and M.C.I. furnished study materials and lesson service for any group of more than five Marines. Extension Schools prepared and administered correspondence courses to parallel the levels and type of instruction presented at the resident Basic School, Communication Officers' Junior and Senior Schools programs, as well as the enlisted Basic Courses.[42]

Within the off-duty education category were eight programs to assist individual or groups of Marines to participate in accredited courses in correspondence schools, secondary schools, colleges, and universities by providing partial payment of tuition costs or instructor salaries. Tuition-Assistance and Instructor-Hire Programs assisted individual Marines while Group Study Classes at Civilian Schools and Group Study Classes on Posts or Stations Programs provided assistance to groups of interested Marines to study in courses at local civilian schools, college, or universities or in courses from near-by schools, college, or universities brought on board the post or station. Group Study Classes through USAFI, USAFI Correspondence Program, and USAFI Self-Teaching Program organized for groups and

individual Marines provided study materials and lesson service groups, volunteer instructors, and correspondence courses from accredited secondary schools, colleges, and universities for individual educational needs. USAFI provided the text book and study guide for the self-teaching program but the student had to pass the final test within twelve months. College and University Correspondence Program was essentially the same as USAFI correspondence courses.[43]

The Marine Corps restated the Department of Defense policy concerning the evaluation of Service training in terms of academic training in 1957. The policy permitted Marines to gain academic credit for their military experiences to help complete requirements for high school or college credits. Service educational institutions authorized by Congress to grant degrees and educational programs conducted through contract with civilian educational institutions were the only exceptions to this policy. The Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) continued to be the agency authorized by the Armed Forces and civilian educational organizations to evaluate Service training in terms of academic credit.[44]

Aggressive Attitude for Off-Duty Education

In 1961 The Off-Duty Education Manual was replaced by The Marine Education Manual and continued to provide guidance to organize, plan, supervise, and administer the off-duty education program as well as counselling requirements. The new manual emphasized preparing Marines for the return to civilian life.[45]

The new accessions to the Marine Corps with high school diplomas were 65.3 percent in 1967 and increased to 66.4 percent in 1966. Concerned with the educational level of Marines, especially the one third without a high school education, the Marine Corps in 1967 reemphasized programs supporting and promoting the achievement of high school education. A high school education could be completed through off-duty study from an accredited secondary school system, completing either the USAFI courses or the USAFI GED battery of tests, or receiving credit for Service school training or military experience through CASE. The Marine Corps provided 75 percent of tuition costs and USAFI's only cost was registration; the courses and tests were free. Marine Corps participation in the various programs in 1967 included 12,806 enrollments, increasing to 17,020 in 1968.[46]

The Marine Corps was reluctant to increase funds or personnel to the off-duty educational activities because of competition for resources with training. An aggressive off-duty education program forcing Marines to choose between using their free time for improving military proficiency or preparing for civilian life was a major concern.[47] Policies remained unchanged and the Marine Corps believed the off-duty program service was adequately funded and manned. An internal report prepared by a select Marine Corps Education Study Panel in 1971 indicated that 11,592 officers and enlisted Marines participated in off-duty education. The panel concluded that programs were adequate and did not recommend making additional commitments to advanced educational opportunities.[48]

The Marine Corps adopted a more aggressive attitude toward education in 1973 when it was discovered that despite earlier programs encouraging high school completion approximately 60,000 Marines, almost twenty percent of the Marine Corps, did not have a high school education, and many others were in need of remedial education or skill training. All commands were encouraged to explore every possibility of improving the quality and quantity of courses offered during off-duty time. The immediate concern of the Marine Corps was command support for the goal to make accredited academic

and vocational courses available to non-high school graduates, those who needed remedial and deficiency training in order to qualify for post secondary training or college, and those who had no civilian related skills to make them employable when they returned to civilian life.[49]

The Marine Corps was driven by huge manpower requirements during the Viet Nam War and enlisted many Marines without high school educations. It was apparent at the end of the War that basic skills ensured by high school diplomas were not possessed by many Marines. The Marine Corps has maintained the policy of encouraging every Marine to acquire a high school diploma and acquire other skills to personally benefit after they return to civilian life.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR REMEDIATION SKILLS, COLLEGE, AND WARTIME

There were several other general educational activities and programs specific in nature and addressed to a limited number of participants with specific needs. Other programs were developed to complement successful activities. When funding was available to allow the establishment of pilot programs, the Marine Corps developed programs to enhance

recruiting, retention, or the personal development of individual Marines.

Slow Learners

In 1952 M.C.I. was directed to develop a Marine Corps Reader for slow-learner and non-English speaking instruction programs in the recruit depots and in off-duty programs throughout the Marine Corps. M.C.I. was also to establish, prepare, and conduct certain slow-learner/non-English speaking courses of instruction for specific technical fields.[50] The Harvard University Graduate School of Education assisted in the development of the slow learners program.[51] The requirements were to accommodate the recruits not proficient enough in English and reading to complete recruit training. Specific courses were required to augment OJT for technical fields. Marine Corps Reserve personnel who had less opportunity for technical schooling and training also used the courses. In 1952 the slow-learner program was established at the Parris Island, South Carolina recruit depot.[52]

The slow-learner program screened recruits for reading, arithmetical, and mental deficiencies and provided limited remedial reading and arithmetical skills instruction for

those recruits in need. Remedial reading was provided on two levels. Level I was for those recruits indicating a 3.0 to 3.9 grade school reading level and Level II for 4.0 to 4.9 grade school reading level. A four week master training syllabus had been developed to provide a special education program of 100 hours of training.[53]

The program was terminated during the late 1950's but was reviewed in 1965 for possible reinstatement. It was not recommended to be reinstituted because the Marine Corps' recruit screening required the successful completion of a battery of tests demonstrating the rough equivalence of a tenth grade education level.[54]

The program had ensured that illiterate recruits would be able to complete recruit training. The program then evolved into a contingency plan or strategy. This plan would ensure the Marine Corps that during periods of mobilization or national emergency and when forced with the possibility of accepting applicants for enlistment with marginal or sub-par intelligence levels, that special recruit training methods and procedures were established. This training had proven ability to graduate well trained Marines with sound knowledge of basic military fundamentals and the ability to perform satisfactorily in future assignments.[55] M.C.I. and staff sections of the

Headquarters shared the belief in the value of the Marine Corps Reader program, its technical courses, and the slow-learner/non-English courses policy guidance as a contingency option.[56]

Special Advanced Degree Programs

The Marine Corps participated in several programs that offered applicants the opportunity for advanced education beyond the baccalaureate level. The White House Fellows Program was one such program established by the President of the United States in 1964.[57] The program was designed to give rising, motivated, and gifted leaders one year of "first-hand, high-level experience" with the operations of the federal government and to increase their knowledge of national affairs. In addition to their duties as special assistants at the White House, with the Vice-President, or Cabinet officers, White House Fellows participated in an education program conducted by the Brookings Institution.[58]

In 1973 another college degree program was established by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York as an alternate method of obtaining a college degree. The Regents External Degree Program was specifically designed for individuals desiring to study

without the benefit of an instructor or interchange with other students. On-campus attendance was not required to earn a Regents Degree. Credits for the program could be earned with regular college courses from regionally accredited institutions of higher learning, recognized proficiency examinations, approved military educational programs, and special assignment of knowledge gained from experience, independent study, or other nontraditional approaches to education.[59]

Apprenticeship Program

The Marine Corps developed an apprenticeship program in conjunction with guidance provided by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. in 1977. This program allowed the Marine Corps to implement a nationally recognized apprenticeship program in MOSs identified as "apprenticeable."[60] Subsequent to the establishment of this program and its standards within the Marine Corps, specified schools were designated as program sponsors for developing apprenticeship programs within their areas of responsibility.[61]

The program was developed to provide an opportunity for Marines to increase MOS proficiency while stimulating

retention and recruiting incentives. The program complemented other recruiting, retention, and training and education efforts. The typical requirements included 2000 hours of on-the-job work experience, an additional 144 hours of related formal instruction, and an optional enrollment into ancillary correspondence courses. This program not only enhanced MOS proficiency by exercising industry-wide identifiable and distinct trades, but provided personal development.[62]

Front Line Series

In the spirit of the Vocational Schools Detachment of 1920, the Marine Corps created the Front Line Series correspondence courses especially for Marines deployed to Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Shield in September 1990. The program was rapidly organized and coordinated as the build up of U.S. military forces accelerated.[63] Developed in conjunction with Syracuse University, the series of eight college level correspondence courses were intended to assist Marines in understanding and adapting to the area. This series of independent courses was tailored to the unique educational and practical needs of the deployed Marines, offering a broad orientation to the

historical, political, geographic, and psychological traditions of the Middle East.[64] Another reason for the program was to alleviate the situation of the disruption of so many Marines' off-duty education programs as a result of the mobilization for Desert Shield.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Al Gray, and the Director of Marine Corps Educational Programs, Dr. Sydell Weiss, suggested that a program be developed to provide the Marines assigned to the Persian Gulf an opportunity to continue their education but also be relative to the geography, culture, history, and international affairs. Syracuse was chosen to help in its development.[65] The courses were delivered to the Marine students complete with reference materials, self-given tests and evaluation tools, paper, pens, and sharpened pencils.[66]

The initial enrollment expectation of 1000 was quickly surpassed when more than 1800 men and women Marines applied. The second month of operation saw another 2000 requests for the undergraduate college-level courses. The courses were to be completed within one year that would earn the student three hours college level credit.[67] Once the fighting began in January 1991, the Front Line Series program was temporarily suspended. When the fighting stopped in February 1991 the program was again activated until the

Marines were re-deployed to their home posts and stations. The series of courses continued to be offered at posts and stations when the Marines returned from the Middle East.

OFF-DUTY AND SPECIAL COLLEGE DEGREE PROGRAMS

From 1956 to the present the Marine Corps has continued to develop post-secondary level education programs to ensure quality officers. After 1958 officers and enlisted Marines in particular billets were educated to ensure the smooth operation of the Marine Corps. The financial requirement for the programs range from no contribution by the Marine Corps to different tuition assistance programs to the fully-funded degree programs.

College Degree Program

In 1956 The Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation (the Cordiner Committee) considered the policies and practices of the Services subsidizing education for officers in return for obligated service. The committee specifically recommended that the Marine Corps consider the establishment of appropriate programs to raise the educational level of its officers,

with particular emphasis on assisting officers in obtaining baccalaureate degrees.[68] The committee also recommended that more non-regular officers of all Services be afforded the opportunity for graduate level education at civilian institutions.[69]

In 1957 the Marine Corps established the College Degree Program to assist career officers in completing college requirements for a baccalaureate degree. Many officers were voluntarily continuing their academic education during off-duty hours by receiving academic credit for in-service training through CASE accreditation, by completing USAFI college level courses, or by completing college level courses offered on-station at or by local colleges and universities, sometimes utilizing tuition-assistance. Many of these officers are unable to meet the residence requirements due to frequent interruptions caused by operational necessities or duty station moves.[70]

The Marine Corps recognized the benefits to be gained from college education for both the individual career officer and the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps continued to encourage and assist those officers who continued their college education through off-duty studies. However, the College Degree Program permitted up to 150 qualified officers to attend accredited colleges or universities on a

full-time basis to fulfill residence requirements for a baccalaureate degree. The eligibility was limited to warrant officers through lieutenant colonels who could complete their degrees within three quarters or two semesters. Any major field leading to a baccalaureate degree was acceptable.[71]

The College Degree Program is still in effect with minor changes from the original program. The eligibility is only slightly more restrictive than the original with a three or four year obligated service, depending on the time required to complete the degree. The time allowed to attend full-time colleges or universities was extended to a maximum of eighteen months to permit officers to take advantage of regular and summer sessions.[72]

Special Education Program

Most billets or specific job positions within the Marine Corps are directed by tables of organization (T/O). The qualifications for the vast majority of T/O billets are correctly expressed in terms of grade and MOS. An individual whose grade and MOS coincide with the grade and MOS requirements of a billet must be presumed qualified to fill a particular billet, regardless of educational

background. Technical advances that continued in weaponry, equipment, systems, tactics and managerial techniques affirmed the need for a number of billets with special education prerequisites.[73] The Marine Corps sought support through legislation in the early 1950's for a limited number of Marines to receive instruction at civilian institutions in highly technical areas for specific billets.[74]

By 1963 the Marine Corps began to define and formalize a Special Education Program (SEP) for T/O billets with special education prerequisites, establish procedures for the identification and designation of such billets, and provided guidelines for the processing of applications.[75] This program was to provide precise identification of special education requirements of T/O billets and estimate special education requirements for the future. The Marines selected for training assignments were sent to the course of instruction and school deemed most appropriate for fulfilling the special education billet requirement.[76]

The current policy and procedures for SEP further identifies and validates the hundreds of billets that are required to be staffed by Marines possessing postgraduate level education. Over seventy five percent of the allocations for postgraduate education are assigned to SEP. Many students attend the Naval Postgraduate School at

Monterey, California or the Air Force Institute of Technology at Dayton, Ohio while the remainder attend certain Marine Corps approved civilian schools. Today the applicants agree to an obligation of an additional three or four years of active duty at the end of the SEP education.[77]

Even though the purpose of SEP was to fill Marine Corps billets as directed by law, Department of Defense policy, or Marine Corps policy with qualified personnel, the applicants for the program perceived the education as self-improvement benefits for a more adept career as well as preparation for civilian life. The applicants actively pursue the billets that SEP will qualify them and are strongly encouraged to discuss career impacts with appropriate counsellors.[78]

Advanced Degree Program

The Advanced Degree Program (ADP) paralleled the development of SEP program during the early 1960's. ADP was designed to augment SEP by providing an additional method of graduate study for career officers to qualify them for SEP billets.[79] ADP also provided career motivated officers an opportunity to obtain graduate degrees in disciplines that directly or indirectly fulfilled other Marine Corps needs or desired skills. ADP provided incentives for the procurement

and retention of career-oriented officers. Officers in the program selected the college or university for the advanced degree enabling G.I. Bill education benefits.[80]

Officers in ADP attended regionally accredited colleges or universities on a full-time basis to fulfill requirements for advanced degrees in disciplines that provided special knowledge or skills considered necessary or desirable for the Marine Corps. The applicants agreed to an obligation of an additional three or four years of active duty at the end of the postgraduate education.[81]

The current policy and procedures for ADP further identify and validate the hundreds of billets that are required to be staffed by Marines possessing postgraduate level education. About twenty five percent of the allocations for postgraduate education are assigned to ADP. Today, the applicants continue to agree to an obligation of an additional three or four years of active duty at the end of the ADP education.[82]

Enlisted Commissioning Program

The Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program (NESEP) began as an exclusive Navy program to aid in officer accession; however, a policy was established by Marine Corps

Order in March 1958 that provided an opportunity for outstanding enlisted men to achieve a career as a Marine Corps officer.[83] By 1960 the areas of scientific study in that Marines were permitted to enter were finalized and accepted by the Navy.[84] Marines applying to participate in NESEP were selected by a board of officers and were then transferred to a Naval Preparatory School for nine weeks of college level preliminary instruction in mathematics, physics, and English usage.[85] In 1965 chemistry was added to the college preparation study. NESEP obligated Marines to four years additional duty after graduation with a baccalaureate degree, successful completion of Officers Candidate School, and receiving a commission as a Second Lieutenant.[86]

In 1973 the Marine Corps established a pilot program for its own enlisted commissioning education program, the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP). Marines participated in NESEP for technical areas of study since MECEP pilot program provided non-technical areas of study including political science, economics, english, history, and business administration. The additional service obligation remained the same as NESEP.[87]

MECEP was a means for exceptional enlisted Marines to earn both a college education and commission in the Marine

Corps. The purpose of MECEP was to augment Officer accession for the Marine Corps as NESEP did for the Navy, however, the MECEP pilot program did not have as an aggressive academic perspective as NESEP.[88] By 1979 MECEP had increased the college preparatory study, the obligated service time, and offered a technical area of study when the Navy disestablished Marine Corps participation in NESEP.[89] MECEP remains available for Marines and the current instruction also lists the colleges and universities that are open to MECEP.[90]

Marine Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP)

In 1968 the Marine Corps established a pilot program to provide a source of career non-commissioned officers (NCOs) who possess a high degree of technical competency in certain designated fields. The Marine Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP) also served to provide an important career retention incentive, particularly in critical fields, to form a core of highly qualified Marines motivated for additional higher education; and to increase the technical knowledge of a large number of Marines by providing incentive to pursue college level studies in an off-duty education program.[91]

The areas of study that were available in MADCOP included engineering and applied mechanics, electronics, mechanisms, drafting, data processing, industrial management, marketing and purchasing, and secretarial studies. Marines were ordered to attend college for up to two years with additional obligated service of four years. The Marine Corps funded the tuition for the completion of the associated degree.[92]

The Congress deleted one program from each Service in 1974 in an attempt to encourage each Service to combine and better coordinate educational programs. MADCOP was selected as the active Marine Corps education program to be deleted in October 1974. Those enrolled but who had not graduated prior to the cut-off date were permitted to continue until graduation. Other programs continued to offer education opportunities but did not offer the incentives of MADCOP.[93]

Degree Completion Program for Staff Non-commissioned Officers

The Marine Corps established another degree completion program in 1971 targeting Staff Non-commissioned Officers (SNCOs). The program was originally staffed in 1970 as part of a study on an all volunteer force. It was established as

an incentive for career SNCOs to maintain service in the Marine Corps by assisting them in completing college requirements for baccalaureate degrees.[94] The program recognized that many SNCOs voluntarily continued academic education during off-duty hours by on-campus and on-station college courses as well as USAFI courses.[95]

Many SNCOs diligently worked toward degrees, but they usually could not meet the residence requirement for the baccalaureate degree. Also recognizing the benefits gained from college training for both individual Marine and the Marine Corps, this SNCO degree completion program was established to permit qualified SNCOs to attend accredited colleges and universities on a full-time basis up to two years to fulfill residence requirements. There was an additional service obligation upon completion of the degree.[96]

Procedures were published in 1975 to identify, justify, validate, and monitor enlisted billets that required college education.[97] "Administrative Procedures for Billets with Enlisted College Level Education Prerequisites" continues to provide valid and meaningful billets for those enlisted Marines who have earned degrees while in the Marine Corps.[98]

SUMMARY

While M.C.I. was relatively slow to develop as the Marine Corps' first stable general education activity, it had never been threatened from external forces prior to the end of World War II. With the establishment of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) following World War II, efforts began to economize and reduce duplication in educational programs within the Services. In 1950, the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces, stirred controversy by reporting that M.C.I. and USAFI duplicated functions. However, that same year, the OSD reported that the M.C.I. was a "training" activity of the Marine Corps. This declaration was an effort to thwart any consolidation of M.C.I. and USAFI, preclude any inspections of M.C.I.'s operation, or issuance of any directives that could have impacted on the operation of M.C.I.

The Marine Corps became defensive toward the mission of M.C.I. and this perceived threat. The Marine Corps began to reevaluate policy toward M.C.I., general education programs and procedures, special education programs, and off-duty education. These actions resulted in a change in general education policy in 1951 by shifting the emphasis of M.C.I.

from general education to primarily training associated with military occupational specialties (MOS). The transition of M.C.I. to MOS training was gradual and the gap created was filled by USAFI programs. M.C.I.'s former guiding principle of providing general education for Marines preparing for return to civilian life was now focusing primarily to assist Marines in improvement of MOS training and proficiency and secondarily receive general education of an academic nature.

In 1953 the autonomy of M.C.I. was threatened again by proposed legislation that would provide authority for OSD to regulate information and education programs within the military Services. M.C.I. expedited its curriculum transition to non-tactical technical training. The Marine Corps, sensing M.C.I. was under siege, began revising the mission and improving the effectiveness of M.C.I. A study indicated that the average knowledge level among all Marines was low, unit training and on-the-job-training (OJT) methods produced only minimum knowledge. The Marine Corps concluded that the average knowledge of Marines should be raised and directed M.C.I. design courses to better prepare technical training as well as "non-tactical correspondence instruction" to contribute to MOS proficiency of individual Marines. The Marine Corps Manual was also changed by dropping some courses, changing the scope of responsibility

for non-tactical correspondence instruction, and modifying procedures for the preparation of M.C.I. courses.

In 1956 the mission of M.C.I. was expanded to include development of all courses in all MOS's, both technical and tactical, to enable Marines to maintain and increase their technical proficiency and prepare for promotion. From 1957 to 1964 the course completion rate increased from 29.2 percent to 45.3 percent while enrollments increased during the same period from 27,000 to 115,000. M.C.I.'s efficiency increased by converting the former manual mechanical method of maintaining records to computer data processing. Today M.C.I. offers 180 courses that provide instruction and training in more than 21 occupational fields for the entire MOS structure of the Marine Corps. There are six non-resident PME programs that parallel the resident programs located at Quantico with 67 courses.

As a result of the new M.C.I. mission, control shifted from Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. to the Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia in 1977. A study recommended emphasis is placed on the Professional Military Education (PME) courses and further consolidation of the Extension School functions within M.C.I. In 1980 M.C.I. became responsible for all correspondence courses for training and education in the

Marine Corps. The PME courses that were incorporated into M.C.I. included the Staff Non-Commissioned Officer, The Basic School, the Amphibious Warfare, and the Marine Corps Command and Staff College Non-resident Programs. The consolidation of the four programs with the 49 subcourses increased M.C.I. enrollment twenty percent to over 129,000 enrollments.

A new concept toward providing general education began to emerge throughout the Department of Defense (DOD): off-duty general education. Off-duty general education opportunities became the alternative for Marines with general education needs. In 1950 Congress began appropriating funding to promoted off-duty education, resident off-duty instruction programs, and civilian instructors of off-duty classes established throughout the Marine Corps. A 1951 survey indicated twenty-five per cent of the Marines sampled were involved in off-duty education.

By late 1952 the Marine Corps began to experience increased pressure from DOD to establish off-duty educational programs. The central control and direction of off-duty education would continue to reside in the Special Services Branch at the Headquarters. Public Law 416 guaranteed the continued existence of the Marine Corps, and this facilitated stable policies and programs for off-duty

education through the mid 1950's. World-wide dispersal of Marine units added pressure to off-duty education programs requiring improvements and publication of The Off-Duty Education Manual in 1957. The manual provided Education Officers and Education Assistants with information to organize, plan, supervise, and administer the off-duty education programs. The manual further discussed counselling and testing required in the program. Within the off-duty education category were eight programs to assist individual or groups of Marines to participate in accredited courses in correspondence schools, secondary schools, colleges, and universities by providing partial payment of tuition costs or instructor salaries. In 1961 The Off-Duty Education Manual was replaced by The Marine Education Manual and continued to provide guidance for the off-duty education program and emphasized preparing Marines for the return to civilian life.

The Marine Corps adopted a more aggressive attitude toward education encouraging all commands to explore every possibility of improving the quality and quantity of courses offered during off-duty time. Driven by huge manpower requirements and the need for basic skills the Marine Corps maintained the policy of encouraging every Marine to obtain a high school diploma and find other skills to personally

benefit after they return to civilian life. When funding was available to allow the establishment of pilot programs, the Marine Corps developed programs to enhance recruiting, retention, or the personal development of individual Marines.

The varied off-duty education programs experienced by the Marine Corps included an apprenticeship program in 1977. This program developed in conjunction with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, allowed Marines in MOSs identified as "apprenticeable" to increase proficiency, stimulating retention, and provide recruiting incentives.

The Marine Corps established the College Degree Program to assist career officers in completing college requirements for a baccalaureate degree in 1957, recognizing the benefits to be gained from college education for both the individual career officer and the Corps. This practice encouraged and assisted those officers who continued their college education through off-duty studies. The College Degree Program is still in effect with minor changes.

Most billets or specific job positions within the Marine Corps are directed by tables of organization (T/O). In 1963 the Marine Corps began to define and formalize a Special Education Program (SEP) for such T/O billets. The

current policy and procedures for SEP further identify and validate the hundreds of billets that are required to be staffed by Marines possessing postgraduate level education. The Advanced Degree Program (ADP) paralleled and augmented the development of SEP providing an additional method of graduate study for career officers to qualify them for SEP billets. The current policy and procedures for ADP further identify and validate the hundreds of billets that are required to be staffed by Marines possessing postgraduate level education.

The Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program (NESEP) began as an exclusive Navy program; however, in 1958 it provided an opportunity for outstanding enlisted Marines to achieve a career as a Marine Corps officer. In 1973 the Marine Corps established a pilot program for its own enlisted commissioning education program, the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Program (MECEP). Marines participated in technical and non-technical areas of study. MECEP remains available for Marines and the current instruction also lists the colleges and universities that are open to MECEP.

In 1968 the Marine Corps established a pilot program to provide a source of career non-commissioned officers (NCOs) who possess a high degree of technical competency in certain

designated fields--The Marine Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP). MADCOP served to provide an important career retention incentive and increase the technical knowledge of a large number of Marines by providing incentive to pursue college level studies. In 1974 MADCOP was deleted.

The Marine Corps established another degree completion program in 1971 targeting Staff Non-commissioned Officers (SNCOs). The Degree Completion Program for Staff Non-commissioned Officers was established as an incentive for career SNCOs to maintain service in the Marine Corps by assisting them in completing college requirements for baccalaureate degrees. The Marine Corps participated in other programs that offered applicants the opportunity for advanced education beyond the baccalaureate level. The White House Fellows Program and the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York as an alternate method of obtaining a college degree were examples of other programs.

In the spirit of the Vocational Schools Detachment of 1920, the Marine Corps created the Front Line Series correspondence courses especially for Marines deployed to Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Shield in September 1990. Developed in conjunction with Syracuse University,

the series of eight college level correspondence courses were intended to assist Marines in understanding and adapting to the area. This series of independent courses was tailored to the unique educational and practical needs of the deployed Marines, offering a broad orientation to the historical, political, geographic, and psychological traditions of the Middle East.

For more than 70 years the Marine Corps provided opportunities for Marines to attempt academic and vocational courses for both their professional development and to prepare them for the return to civilian life. The Marine Corps has continued to maintain a policy to encourage every Marine to acquire a high school diploma and other skills to benefit and prepare for the return to civilian life.

Newly established Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) endeavored to consolidate M.C.I. and the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), despite opposing recommendations. The Marine Corps determined to preserve M.C.I. as its own training and education and general education activity. The Marine Corps changed its institutional educational focus and the mission of M.C.I. from instilling post-discharge career skills to ensuring MOS proficiency and academic/technical retention.

There was a significant shift in the mission of M.C.I. from general education toward MOS training and education. This shift was used as a rationale to maintain the Marine Corps' autonomous correspondence institution, M.C.I. The general education opportunities were then offered by new programs utilizing off-duty time, on-duty time, or in combinations. Programs established during World War II provided opportunities for Marines to participate in vocational training, remedial and deficiency courses, academic and vocational high schools, post secondary training,and college and university courses. A revised mission gave M.C.I. all correspondence responsibilities for Marine Corps training and education. M.C.I.'s reputation for economical superiority over USAFI was driven by sever budgetary considerations. The Marine Corps sought and received legislation providing for Marine training and education as well as general education in off-duty and civilian educational programs.

NOTES

1. HQMC News Release (Washington: Headquarters, Marine Corps, 1948), 39, Gerald Langford, "Even in a Foxhole,: Marine Corps Gazette, June, 1944, 53, and Ripley S. Sima, Writing the USAFI Correspondence Course, (Madison: United States Armed Forces Institute, 1960), 5. The Army Institute began organizing December 24, 1941 and was formally established in April 1942 at its headquarters in Madison, Wisconsin. In February 1943 the facilities and services were extended to all armed Services and was renamed United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI). Its principal assumption was "citizens in military uniform are interested in continuing their civilian education" and its mission was to provide civilian type education opportunities to members of the Armed Services. USAFI provided academic courses through correspondence study but differed from M.C.I. in that it was designed as a civilian organization under the supervision of the War Department and Navy Department and supported all Services. In contrast to the instruction in military subjects offered by all Armed Services, USAFI engaged professional educators and employed carefully validated civilian standards in the preparation of instructional and valuative materials.

In early 1943 the Educational Services Section was created in the Bureau of Naval Personnel immediately benefiting the Marine Corps. Marines were authorized to enroll directly into USAFI self-taught or correspondence courses and any tests not available through M.C.I. Through the early relationship with USAFI the American Council on Education was able to accredit many of the M.C.I. courses further benefiting the Marine Corps.

2. HQMC News Release, 1948. However, another Marine Corps publication, Home of the Commandants by Karl Schoundants in 1966, presents a direct confrontation with the testimony of the representative from the Secretary of the Navy. Schoundants' account of the Marines attached to the Marine Barracks, Washington D.C. indicates on page 157: "one of the two companies marching in the Evening Parade, is, surprisingly, a company of "part-time" marchers whose primary duty if the operation of the Marine Corps Institute." This is the opposite purpose of the Marines at M.C.I..

3. Official letter from Assistant Chief of Staff G-3 to Commandant of the Marine Corps (AO3C-huk/18 June 1953), Enclosure (1), regarding missions and functions of the Marine Corps Institute.

4. Ibid and Official letter from Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of Marine Corps Institute, (AOC3-mja/31 March 1952), Subj: Educational Assistance for Recruit Training Programs and Specialist Training Courses.

5. Official letter from the Director of Marine Corps Institute to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (AD-459-op/Ser: 921-53/10 Mar 1953), Subj: Recommendation of Marine Corps Institute Mission, request for. (Colonel Jack Juhan, Director M.C.I., recommended that the primary emphasis be shifted from the non-tactical general education curriculum designed principally for academic accreditation to a curriculum stressing non-tactical technical type courses prepared primarily to assist the individual Marine in maintaining and increasing his military proficiency and secondarily to receive civilian academic accreditation for the Marine student.)

6. Official letter from Director of Personnel to Chief of Staff (10 March 1953), Subj: Marine Corps Institute: affects of proposed permanent legislation for Information and Education on.

7. Official correspondence, Memorandum from Head, Promotion Branch, Colonel E. P. Foley to Director of Personnel (DHC-1839-hwm/6 March 1953), regarding promotion testing.

8. Official letter, from Assistant Chief of Staff G-3 to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (AO3C-hvk/18 June 1953), regarding changing functions of M.C.I.

9. Official letter from Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-hvk/24 August 1953), Subj: Mission of the Marine Corps Institute and Marine Corps Manual, (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1953), 18 and Official letter from Director of M.C.I. to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, (D-459-whd/Ser 1146/3 September 1953), Subj: Change in Marine Corps Institute mission.

10. Official letter Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-mrh/8 December 1953), Subj: Mission and curriculum of the Marine Corps Institute and related matters.

11. Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., Unit Diary Number 197-54, (18 October 1954).

12. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-wrt/10 September 1956), Subj: Curriculum of the Marine Corps Institute.

13. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-jmg/19 May 1958), Subj: Reorganization of Marine Corps correspondence training.

14. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools and the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-mw/20 September 1958), Subj: Consolidation of the Training and Education Unit with the Marine Corps Institute.

15. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-pwh/17 July 1961), Subj: Mission and Functions of the Marine Corps Institute.

16. Briefing Papers on Marine Corps Institute from 1964, unpublished papers provided by Colonel Hazel Benn, USMC (Ret), from her private papers.

17. Official letters from the Commandant of the Marine Corps (3A/afg/11 January 1965), 2., Commanding Officer, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (30:BLH:peb/3 February 1966), (30:MJM:peb/22 December 1966), and (30:MJM:bjh/28 February 1968), Subj: Command Chronology. (The report made available to commanders was the M.C.I. Unit Activity Report, which listed Marines enrolled for individually commands.)

18. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools and the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-mek/16 January 1964), Subj: Instructional Course Material issued by Extension School and the Marine Corps Institute.

19. Official letters from the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, (3A/afg/11 January 1965), Subj: Instructional Course Material issued by Extension School and the Marine Corps Institute, from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools, (AO3C-mek/10 February 1965), Subj: Instructional Course Material issued by Extension School and the Marine Corps Institute, and from the Director of M.C.I. to the Officer-In-Charge, Course preparation Section, (HQ:JJJ:mlg/11 March 1965), Subj: Liaison with Extension School. (The Commandant of the Marine Corps approved the recommendation and directed that "close liaison be continued" between M.C.I. and the Extension School to minimize duplication and improve efficiency of training materials. The Director of M.C.I. began a policy where all course materials were forwarded to the Extension School for review. By 1966 M.C.I. had converted 80,000 records to punch cards.

20. Lee Hughes, "More than Mailorder Courses," Marine Corps Gazette, February 1979, 21.

21. Ibid, and Official letter from Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (C 03/1500/19 January 1978), Subj: Command Chronology.

22. Warren S. Walters, "Postpaid Training," Marine Corps Gazette, August 1966, 48. (Walters reported that only about 46% completed their courses.

23. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AS-3-23/mkm/#633/5 January 1971), Subj: GAO Report to Congress on Management Improvements Needed at the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI).

24. CMC Washington DC message ALMAR 240/83 (022349Z NOV 83), Subj: Achievement of 90 Percent Completion Rate for the Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.) Programs.

25. Official letter from Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (C 03/1500/19 January 1981), Subj: Command Chronology.

26. Hughes, 21.

27. Official letter from Commanding Officer, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., (3A:DMO:raa/5750/31 March 1981), Subj: Command Chronology.

28. Marine Corps Institute Order P1550.1Q, Volume II, (1981), 6.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Survey of Interest in Off-Duty Education, Prepared by the Procedures Analysis Office, Office of the Director of Personnel, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, November 1951, 1 and 5.

32. Official letter from the Director of Personnel, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, via the Director Plans and Policies, Subj: Improvement of off-duty educational facilities at posts and stations within the Marine Corps, DSL-1581-alh, 3 December 1951 and The Endorsement on the Director of Personnel letter,DSL-1581-alh, 3 December 1951 to CMC, AO-1-hmh, 7 January 1952. (The Director of Plans and Policies recommended that improvements should be delayed.)

33. Ibid.

34. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Judge Advocate General, Subj: Navy and Marine Corps Personnel Instruction at Civilian Institutions, proposed legislation for, DB-311-mfw, 11 July 1951.

35. Memorandum from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, to Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Responsibility for Education and Information matters, ACSC-yms, 28 November 1952 and Memorandum from the Head, Policy Analysis Division to Chief of Staff, G-3, 8 December 1952.

36. Philip N. Pierce and Frank O. Hough, The Compact History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1960), 305-306.

37. Off-Duty Education Manual, U.S. Marine Corps, NAVMC 1143-PD, 28 February 1957, 1-3.

38. Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (personnel and Reserve Forces), Subj: Recommendations for the use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, DSL-2420-mlw, 29 January 1957.

39. Off-Duty Education Manual, iii and ix.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid, 3-1. Education aids the individual broaden horizons, discipline the mind, and live congenially with people, training serves the specific and prepares individuals for a job or jobs.

42. Ibid, 3-1 to 3-3, 4-1 to 4-4.

43. Ibid.

44. Marine Corps Order 1560.8, Subj: Evaluation of Service training in terms of academic credit, 19 January 1957.

45. Marine Corps Order, 1560.16, Subj: Marine Corps Education Manual, 4 January 1961, 1-2, 2-2. (The current version of the Marine Corps Education Manual is MCO 1560.16B, 4 January 1972.)

46. Memorandum from the G-1, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Subj: High School Diploma Programs, 1500, III-D-3-a, DS:jbg, 12 January 1967. (not to exceed $42.75 per Carnegie unit)

47. Memorandum on AO3 comment on Personnel Department Route Sheet, DX-dlc of 6 November 1968, Subj: Review and Evaluation of Armed Forces Adult Education Programs, AO3C50-clb, 1500, 15 November 1968.

48. Education of the Corps, a report of the Marine Corps Education Study Panel, unpublished report for the Commandant of the Marine Corps, 1971, 4-5, 4-6, 4-18. Their approach was summarized by the statement: while such as system of bribery may be applicable to the other Services, at such time as it becomes necessary to motivate Marines by promises of advance degrees or other educational opportunities, the Corps will be in jeopardy.[27]

49. Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Subj: Improving the Quality of the Education and Transition Programs, 15 March 1973.

50. Off-Duty Education Manual, 1-2.

51. Letter from P. J. Rulon, Professor of Education, Harvard University Graduate School of Education to the Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, 8 December 1952 and Official letter from the Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Subj: P. J. Rulon, Professor of Education, Harvard University, visit at Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C., WKM:erm, A20, 6 January 1953. (This correspondence discussed the development of the "slow learners" program and the request to visit the recruit depot for sampling recruits involved in the program.)

52. Ibid.

53. Memorandum for the Under Secretary of the Navy from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Special Education Program for Marine Recruits (Slow Learners), 21 September 1965.

54. Official letter to the Commandant of the Marine Corps from the Assistant Chief of Staff,G-3, SubJ: Special Education Program for Slow Learners at Marine Corps Recruit Depots, AO3C2O-mek, 27 September 1965. The new accessions were screened and believed to be beyond the area of slow learners and through normal functioning, not required to obtain any special training.

55. Memorandum for the Under Secretary of the Navy from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Special Education Program for Marine Recruits (Slow Learners), 21 September 1965.

56. Off-Duty Education Manual, 1-2.

57. Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: White House Fellows Program, DSL-dw, 15 September 1966.

58. Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: White House Fellows Program, DX, 20 October 1971.

59. Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: Regents External Degree Program, DX:JH:mec, 21 February 1973. The degrees offered included an Associates of Arts, an Associate in Applied Science in Nursing, and a Bachelors of Science Degree in Business Administration.

60. Marine Corps Order 1550.22A, Subj: U.S. Marine Corps Apprenticeship Program, TRI91-plc, 11 February 1981.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid.

63. "Airlift to Gulf: Homework and Pencils," New York Times, Wednesday, 28 November 1990, B9.

64. Front Line Series, (pamphlet from Syracuse University, 1990), 2. (The courses included Introduction to Arabic, Introduction to the Solar System, Elementary Concepts of Mathematic, Political Geography of the Middle East, Social Psychology: A Global Perspective on Human Behavior in Socio-Cultural Context, The World at War, and Basic Concepts in Exercise Science and Physical Conditioning.)

65. "In the trenches college classes to allay boredom," The Boston Globe, Monday, 26 November 1990, 31, 35.

66. "Marines to Go SU-in Desert," The Post-Standard, Syracuse, Thursday, 20 September 1990, A-1, A-8.

67. "SU's Classroom In Desert Draws Reinforcements," The Post Standard, Syracuse, Thursday, 29 November 1990, A-1, A-8. The Marine Corps paid for each course.

68. Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (P&RF) from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, Subj: Obligated Service in Return for Subsidized Education, CPTC/D-10, 8 October 1956.

69. Ibid.

70. Marine Corps Order 1560.7 with Changes 1, 2, and 3, Subj: College Degree Program, AO1-jlj, 5 March 1956 (Ch. 1, 22 May 1958, Ch. 2, 24 October 1958, and Ch. 3, 20 May

1959). This MCO required aviators to attend a school near a Marine Corps Air Station because annual minimum flight hour requirements were not curtailed. This requirement limited aviators to the liberal nature of the College Degree Program. The requirement was finally terminated in the 1970's.

71. Ibid.

72. Marine Corps Order 1560.7H, Subj: College Degree Program, TDE-44, 17 April 1986.

73. Headquarters Order 1500.5C, Subj: Marine Corps Training Program for Billets with Special Education Prerequisites, AO1E-3-mas, 11 August 1967.

74. Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Judge Advocate General, 11 July 1951.

75. Memorandum for Record, from Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps, Subj: Approved Postgraduate Education Requirements, AO1A-kb, 22 April 1963.

76. Headquarters Order 1500.5C, 11 August 1967, Ibid.

77. Marine Corps Order 1500.9E, Subj: Special Education Program (SEP), MMOA-3-MM-clw, 28 June 1983.

78. Ibid.

79. Marine Corps Order 1560.19B, Subj: Advanced Degree Program, DX:LCM:gjs, 15 February 1973.

80. Ibid.

81. Ibid.

82. Marine Corps Order 1560.19C, Subj: Advanced Degree Program (ADP), MMOA-3-MM-rjn, 8 September 1981.

83. Headquarters Marine Corps All Marine Corps (ALMAR) Message 171613Z Feb 58, From Commandant of the Marine Corps to ALMAR, 17 February 1958 and Memorandum from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program, AO3C-ccp, 7 March 1958.

84. Marine Corps Order 1560.15, Subj: Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program for enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps, DPB-pjh, 24 June 1960. (The areas of study available under NESEP included Engineering, Science, Mathematics, and Statistics. Within the engineering area were specialties including aeronautical, chemical, civil, electrical, engineering mechanics, industrial, materials, mechanical, metallurgical, and engineering administration. The science area included specialties in aerology, physics, chemistry, geography (geomorphology), psychology, electronics, and nucleonics.)

85. Ibid. (The preparatory schools were located on each coast. The Naval Preparatory School was located at the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland and the Service School Command was located at the Naval Training Center, San Diego, California.)

86. Marine Corps Order 1560.15B, Subj: Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program for Enlisted Personnel of the Marine Corps, DPB-leg, 10 August 1965.

87. Marine Corps Order 1560.22, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP) (Pilot Program), DX-NJL-gjs, 12 April 1973.

88. Ibid.

89. Information Paper by M. G. Spiese, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MRRO-6r, 2 December 1986 and Marine Corps Order 1560.15J, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MRRO-6a, 1 October 1984. The college preparatory study was increased from nine to ten weeks. The obligated service after commissioning via MECEP has been increased from four to six years. The technical areas of study include electrical/electronic engineering, mechanical engineering/engineering mechanics, civil engineering, aerospace engineering, industrial engineering, metallurgical engineering, nuclear engineering, chemistry, systems/ operations analysis, computer science, mathematics, physics, and applied mathematics. The non-technical areas of study include political science, economics, English, history, sociology, psychology, business administration, modern language, and journalism.

90. Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MMRO-6o, 3 August 1988.

91. Official letter from the Head, Personnel Plans & Programs Branch, to the Assistance Chief of Staff, G-1, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Subj: Establishment of an Enlisted Career Education Plan; Marine Associated Degree Completion Program (MADCOP), AO1C/dmp-21, 30 June 1967 and Point paper, Subject: Establishment of a Marine Associated Degree Completion Program (MADCOP) as a part of the Enlisted Career Education Plan, AO1C/jef-21, 30 June 1967.

92. Ibid.

93. Headquarters Marine Corps All Marine Corps (ALMAR) Message 050016Z Nov 74, From Commandant of the Marine Corps to ALMAR, MCBUL 1560 Marine Corps Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP), 16 February 1974.

94. Memorandum from Deputy Director of Personnel to Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1 and Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Proposed SNCO Degree Completion Program, DX-af, 22 January 1971; G-1 Comments on DepDirPers R/S of 20 January 1971, Subj: SNCO Degree Completion Program, AO1C/ lkh-31, 10 February 1971; AO3 Comment on DepDirPers R/S of 20Jan71, Subj: SNCO Degree Completion Program, AO3C43-sl, 16 February 1971; HQMC Brief Sheet from Deputy Director of Personnel to Chief of Staff, Subj: Proposed MCO 1560.__, Subj: Degree Completion for SNCO's, DX, 6 May 1971; Memorandum from Head, Task Force Project Volunteer to Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower), Subj: Proposed Marine Corps Order concerning Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, review of, AO1B-dkp, 10 May 1971; G-1 Comments on DepDirPers R/S of 4May71, Subj: MCO 1560.__ Degree Completion Program for SNCO's (Pilot), AO1C-gmm-21, 12 May 1971; HQMC Brief Sheet from Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower) to Chief of Staff, Subj: Proposed MCO 1560.__, "Degree Completion for Staff Noncommissioned Officers", DX, 23 June 1971; Memorandum for the Chief of Staff, Subj: SNCO Degree Program, D-mbs, 29 June 1971; and Memorandum from Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower) to Chief of Staff, Subj: Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, 12 July 1971. These were internal Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps memorandum and correspondence concerning the proposal of the SNCO Degree Completion Program. From

90. Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MMRO-6o, 3 August 1988.

91. Official letter from the Head, Personnel Plans & Programs Branch, to the Assistance Chief of Staff, G-1, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Subj: Establishment of an Enlisted Career Education Plan; Marine Associated Degree Completion Program (MADCOP), AO1C/dmp-21, 30 June 1967 and Point paper, Subject: Establishment of a Marine Associated Degree Completion Program (MADCOP) as a part of the Enlisted Career Education Plan, AO1C/jef-21, 30 June 1967.

92. Ibid.

93. Headquarters Marine Corps All Marine Corps (ALMAR) Message 050016Z Nov 74, From Commandant of the Marine Corps to ALMAR, MCBUL 1560 Marine Corps Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP), 16 February 1974.

94. Memorandum from Deputy Director of Personnel to Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1 and Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Proposed SNCO Degree Completion Program, DX-af, 22 January 1971; G-1 Comments on DepDirPers R/S of 20 January 1971, Subj: SNCO Degree Completion Program, AO1C/ lkh-31, 10 February 1971; AO3 Comment on DepDirPers R/S of 20Jan71, Subj: SNCO Degree Completion Program, AO3C43-sl, 16 February 1971; HQMC Brief Sheet from Deputy Director of Personnel to Chief of Staff, Subj: Proposed MCO 1560.__, Subj: Degree Completion for SNCO's, DX, 6 May 1971; Memorandum from Head, Task Force Project Volunteer to Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower), Subj: Proposed Marine Corps Order concerning Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, review of, AO1B-dkp, 10 May 1971; G-1 Comments on DepDirPers R/S of 4May71, Subj: MCO 1560.__ Degree Completion Program for SNCO's (Pilot), AO1C-gmm-21, 12 May 1971; HQMC Brief Sheet from Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower) to Chief of Staff, Subj: Proposed MCO 1560.__, "Degree Completion for Staff Noncommissioned Officers", DX, 23 June 1971; Memorandum for the Chief of Staff, Subj: SNCO Degree Program, D-mbs, 29 June 1971; and Memorandum from Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower) to Chief of Staff, Subj: Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, 12 July 1971. These were internal Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps memorandum and correspondence concerning the proposal of the SNCO Degree Completion Program. From

the initial inception in mid January to mid July the concept was debated and finally approved.

95. Marine Corps Order 1560.21, Subj: Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, DX:af, 13 July 1971 and Marine Corps Order 1560.21B, Subj: Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, OTTE-40-cls, 11 March 1977. This program was made available to MADCOP graduates in 1977, which would provide all four years of a baccalaureate degree to enlisted Marines.

96. Marine Corps Order 1560.21, ibid.

97. Headquarters Order 1500.10, Subj: Administrative Procedures for Identification and Validation of Enlisted College Level Education Billets, MPC-54:jmb, 5 March 1975.

98. Headquarters Order 1500.10A, Subj: Administrative Procedures for Billets with Enlisted College Level Education Prerequisites, MPC-54-sjb, 28 April 1982 and Marine Corps Order 1500.48, Subj: Administrative Procedures for Billets with Enlisted College Level Education Prerequisites, MPC-59, 1 May 1989.

Chapter VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

The several histories written about Marine Corps training and education efforts have focused on job or skills performance with very little about general education. General education, as the second type of education system within the Marine Corps, has been little studied and is commonly unknown. The nature and circumstances that permitted the establishment of general education activities, the educational style they took, their purposes, and the support measures required to sustain them have changed as the mission and size of the Marine Corps has evolved.

The problem investigated in this study centered on several broad questions: What general education programs and institutions were established in the Marine Corps? Who were the influential leaders affecting the establishments of these programs? What was the relationship of size and mission? What were the conditions surrounding their creation? What purpose did they serve? What educational styles were used in the programs? What were the support

measures required to sustain these programs? What does general education contribute to the Marine Corps?

The principal sources of information for this study include histories of the Marine Corps such as Simmons (1976), Millett (1980), Clifford (1973), and Mersky (1983). Unpublished and primary materials located at the Marine Corps Historical Center, the National Archives, and the Library of Congress, all in Washington, D.C. and the Marine Corps Combat Development Command, in Quantico, Virginia proved very beneficial to the study. A series of interviews was conducted with human sources including Richard Long, Charles Smith, Colonel Hazel Benn, USMC, Ret., Dr. Sydell Weiss, and Hadys Hendrix.

From 1739, when the forerunner organization of the United States Marine Corps began within the American colonies, the Marine Corps has continued to create general education activities as needs arose. After two hundred and fifty-three years, the Marine Corps from its small original organization, established with a limited mission, and without any general education programs for its members, is nearly two hundred thousand strong, a specified mission has

evolved and administers a plethora of general education programs. Throughout five specific periods, the development of the Marine Corps general education programs resulted from unique circumstances and a variety of influential change agents.

The Armed Forces of the United States constitute the world's largest educational institutions. Today the high rate of personnel turnover, the increasingly complex demands that the revolution in military technology places upon military personnel, and the external requirements of the Congress have forced all of the Services to develop comprehensive and widespread programs of training and education.[1] These programs include skills training, professional military education, and general education.

Colonial Period to the Spanish-American War (1739-1898)

The earliest organizations of colonial Marines, established in 1739 followed by another in 1763, had few assets or time to spend on training and education and nothing for general education. The training and education for Marines during the Revolutionary War remained rudimentary, but concentrated on instilling pride and discipline in the troops. Early Marine organizations, the

forerunner of the United States Marine Corps, had a total absence of general education; however, this became remedied as the Marine Corps evolved.

The subordination of the United States Marine Corps by the Army and Navy did not provide any relief for general education needs. Once Commandant Wharton established the Marine Corps' first formal training and education program in 1808, the Marine Corps' began reviewing its training and education and general education needs. The Navy's schoolmaster program, which began in 1823, excluded Marines from participation. Marines had to provide for their own general education needs, individually.

Following the official inclusion into the Navy Department in 1834, the Marine Corps could request funds for training from its own Service Department. The Marine Corps was no longer being bureaucratically passed between the War and Navy Departments without resolution of its requests.

In 1839, the Marine Corps experienced its first general education effort when Commandant Henderson established a school for Marine Corps Band apprentices and Marines serving at the Marine Corps Barracks, Washington, D.C. This school provided general education primarily for young boys in the band but general education was also available for Marines. Henderson also contributed to standardizing Marine Cops

training and education and general education with other programs and regulations throughout his tenure (1820-1859).[2]

The publication of the Marine Manual in 1805 regulated and standardized recruit training and education. In 1891, under the guidance of Commandant Heywood, the Marine Corps established a significant effort as a standard training and education program for entry-level officers--the School of Application. Following 1891, the Marine Corps began standardized training and education for enlisted recruits and entry-level officers, throughout their career. Service-level support of these stable and institutionalized training and education programs set the ground work for all Marine Corps training and education and general education programs that followed.

These four major contributions--Wharton's formal training and education order, Henderson's general educational program establishment, Heywood's publication of the Marine Corps Handbook, and initiation of the School of Application--exhibited the fundamental enthusiasm and initiative necessary to fulfil training and education needs, to include general education activities. The lack of institutional support impeded general education efforts.

Before these early efforts and these individuals' leadership, Marines were excluded from general educational

activity. Marines received minimal standardized training with limited funds. Although Marines were assigned to support Army and Navy organizations and missions, neither Service claimed responsibility or sponsorship for Marine education. The law officially assigned the Marine Corps to the Navy Department, secured sponsorship, and provided funds for standardized Marine Corps military skills training, professional military education, and general education.

Professional military schooling efforts in training and education as well as general educational made considerable progress among all the Services by the beginning of the Spanish-American War. The Marine Corps had begun professionalization and "self-betterment" for individual Marines.[3] The status of general education activity was very limited; however, efforts were to continue.

Post-Spanish-American War to World War I period (1898-1919)

The Marine Corps expended great effort to secure a unique mission from 1898 to 1919, the advanced base defense. Marine Corps leaders realized that responsibility for an advanced base force was a means to sustain the Corps' permanent status, provided a valid reason for continued existence, and replaced the argument for assigning Marines

as ships' guards. Marine leaders also realized that significant training and education requirements would result with any new mission adaptation. Expansion, modernization, and professionalism associated with a new mission requiring additional training and education.

Modernization in the Marine Corps began in late 1890's with obvious training needs and educational requirements in the maintenance and operation of new equipment such as the Naval rifle and Colt-Browning machine-gun. The organizational expansion demanded a corresponding expansion in training requirements in the tactics, techniques, and procedures to integrate the modern equipment and larger force. The Marine Corps' modernization also included the adaptation of other weapons, land vehicles, and the airplane. Aircraft integration caused new Marine missions and techniques before and during World War I.

The Marine Corps' School of Application began operation again in September 1899. Subsequently, Commandant Elliott arranged to send Marines to both the Naval War College and the Army Command and General Staff College, the latter established in 1907. This action furthered the effort of the Marine Corps professionalism movement with officers attending the other Services' professional colleges studying tactics, techniques, and procedures applicable to the Marine

Corps. In 1909, some Marine units established formal programs for non-commissioned officer instruction with standardized leadership and professional training and education.

In 1910, the Marine Corps Advanced Base School at New London, Connecticut was established. The school's mission was to train officers and enlisted Marines in advanced base force and expeditionary service. By 1911 many within the Marine Corps officer corps wanted reform, professionalism, and assurance of the advanced base force mission. This quiet revolt established the Marine Corps Association. In 1912 Marine Corps Gazette, its periodical, began publication providing Marine Corps officers a forum for addressing ideas, policy, training and education, tactics, and equipment.

By 1916 the Marine Corps had institutionalized a standard fourteen week training program for recruits. Involvement in formal professional school programs, professional organizations, and non-military organizations indicated the strides the Marine Corps made in training and education, particularly in military skills training and professional military education. The activities developed during this period paralleled the development of similar activities in the Army and Navy and institutionalized

general education within the Marine Corps was sure to follow.

The development of the advanced base defense concept was preempted in 1917 by World War I and the subsequent attachment of the Marines to the American Expeditionary Force in France under the U.S. Army. The Marine Corps had established the framework for a unique mission and began to adapt training and education to the new mission requirements.

Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy in the Wilson Administration, provided a model philosophy of education that contributed to the Marine Corps' emerging general education philosophy also its first significant general education effort. In 1913 all Navy ships and stations had established general education schools unlike the earlier schoolmaster program. Marines now had permission to participate in this program, an initiative of the Secretary Daniels, rescinding the nine decades of exclusion for Marines from general education in the schoolmaster program aboard Navy ships and stations. Daniels not only influenced the future of the Marine Corps general education activities, but directly orchestrated more liberal type general education programs within the Navy. He was convinced every sailor and Marine should not only learn

the fundamentals aboard ships, but also learn a trade. He established schools on every ship and station for enlisted sailors and Marines, made attendance compulsory, and required young officers to instruct the teaching. The program provided opportunity for some seamen to acquire an education, an opportunity with continued education to attend the Naval Academy, and earn a commission as an officer in the Navy. This Navy University afloat offered any seaman basic education or, if qualified, secondary education.

Another short-lived experiment in general education also provided a model for the Marine Corps. The American Expeditionary Force (AEF) University offered servicemen serving in France after World War I basic education, high school completion, and college completion. Lejeune was in a position to observe the development and administration of the AEF University. He was convinced that the best thing for Marines returning to Quantico from World War I was to build up and restore the morale with an extensive educational system and a chance to go to school. This school was not to be compulsory but voluntary. He envisioned what a military organization could be when every person who came into the service was provided an opportunity to obtain an education.

This short-lived educational effort at Quantico, Virginia was the forerunner for all Marine Corps general education programs and provided a basis for an educational department within the Headquarters of the Marine Corps.

Vocational Schools Detachment Period (1919-1920)

General Lejeune assumed command of Quantico Marine Corps Base a year after the World War I armistice, and established the Vocational Schools Detachment. He was convinced it was best to build the morale of the officers and men so he conquered many obstacles and prototyped the Marine Corps Institute by vindicating Daniels' philosophy of the military services benefiting their members. Lejeune incorporated this philosophy; however, where Daniels had failed in an over ambitious "Navy University," Lejeune succeeded by beginning on a more calculated and smaller scale activity, the Vocational Schools Detachment. Lejeune envisioned a replica of the A.E.F. University model providing an opportunity for every Marine to obtain an education.

The Vocational Schools Detachment activities at Quantico built on the philosophies of influential individuals and models of general education for Service

personnel. Pre- and post-War educational activities helped some in leadership positions within the Marine Corps recognize the need for general education for Marines. Lejeune, in particular, envisioned a vocational school to provide Marines a means to better themselves and Lieutenant Colonel William C. Harllee turned Lejeune's idea into an institution.

Lejeune was a visionary and hoped Marines would enlist and remain in the Marine Corps to better themselves; the standards of the Marine Corps would be improved as a result, and ultimately the country would benefit from this endeavor. Classes began on December 5, 1919 with more than 70 students attending the first classes of the automobile and typewriting and stenography courses. Lejeune established several support activities to fit Marines in the vocational schools to jobs or occupations available upon their separation from the Marine Corps.

Daniels was first to use the name "Marine Corps Institute" in a news release. He described the educational institution within the Marine Corps as "great" and ranked with the foremost schools of the country. The release also described the organization of the school as a grammar school, a high school, manual training school and eventually

collegiate courses corresponding to some of the better small colleges in the United States.

Lieutenant Colonel Harllee, after studying the International Correspondence School (I.C.S.) bulletin "Looking Ahead," concluded that correspondence courses were the answer to the problem of appropriate course material to accommodate the expanding vocational training needs. Correspondence courses were not only a popular educational medium of various educators of the time, but the centralized training and standardization of the I.C.S. courses for instructors resolved other problems. Harllee and his assistant, Captain Shuler, traveled substantially and scrutinized many schools and colleges at all levels in early 1920. After close examination of the I.C.S. study materials they concluded these materials were ideally suited for the Quantico schools. Harllee and Shuler returned to Quantico on February 2, 1920 with enough materials from I.C.S. to supply each Marine enrolled in the vocational schools.

This experimental program quickly gained official approval from Major General Commandant Barnett. He approved of the basic concept of education for Marines when time was available and particularly liked the idea of officers taking turns as instructors for not only their development, but the good of the Marine Corps. The success of the vocational

schools was queried by a legislative group on February 26, 1920, when the House Naval Affairs Committee summoned Generals Lejeune and Butler to testify on the new educational program.

A battalion of Marines from Quantico dispatched for expeditionary duty in reaction to a crisis in Mexico, during May, 1920 challenged the ability to support the program "Corps-wide." Six hundred fifty of the 1200 Marines in the battalion were students of the vocational schools and most of them wanted to continue their course work while on board their ship, the USS Henderson. First Lieutenant LeGette accompanied the battalion, acted as a liaison for the schools, and enrolled any Marines requesting schooling within the battalion to ensure that students could continue their study and work. Supplies and equipment requirements were carefully arranged. The students off the coast of Mexico did not interrupt their study. Two weeks after the battalion had departed from Quantico, lessons and examination papers were received and processed. The expeditionary nature of the Marine Corps did not alter Lejeune's plan upon that the system of schools was founded.

The success of the correspondence method of education was so great that when General Lejeune was appointed Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, in June, 1920, one

of his first official acts was to authorize Harllee to extend the scope of the "institute" to the entire corps. Every Marine was given the opportunity to improve his education regardless of his duty station. The expanded variety of courses enabled Marines to select courses related to experiences.

M.C.I. increased significantly from fewer than 900 students in June 1920 to over 4,000 in October 1920. This rapid growth created additional overhead administration requirements for the staff at Quantico. A frustration over the seemingly unsurmountable workload began to demoralize the small M.C.I. staff. It became apparent to Lejeune and Harllee that the Institute was in jeopardy, partially because of its success. The Marine Corps could not continue to provide classroom instruction to every Marine as it was initially envisioned nor could M.C.I. at Quantico continue to maintain the increasing requirements to provide administrative services with its small staff. On November 10, 1920 orders were issued, and with the use of a tug boat, the entire M.C.I. was towed up the Potomac River to Washington on a barge to operate directly under Lejeune with Harllee in change of its operation. Lejeune announced on November 12, 1920 that M.C.I. would manage "its instruction entirely in the correspondence school method." Funding for

M.C.I. was a part of the "Maintenance Marine Corps" appropriations and not from special appropriations as was the case with the Army and Navy for their general education activities.

The educational activity that began in December 1919 had been called the Post Schools, the Quantico Schools, the Vocational Schools, The Marine Corps Institute, the Marine Corps University, and several other names. References to Quantico's educational program and specifically the schools was confusing. The matter of an agreeable name was settled with the June 11, 1920 publication of the Marine Corps Institute Bulletin Number 1. The order stated the establishment of the schools as the MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE (M.C.I.). The official title of the Vocational Schools Detachment was changed on July 1, 1920 to the Marine Corps Institute Detachment. On that same date Lieutenant Colonel Harllee was detached from Marine Barracks, Quantico and ordered to Marine Corps Headquarters in Washington, D.C. as Chief of the Educational Section.

Although Lejeune's program received positive responses, the total number of Marines attending instruction was about five percent of the population of the Quantico post. This indicated relatively little interest in education or self-improvement among the Marines at Quantico, who refused to

take advantage of the courses and instruction offered at no charge. Marines, many of whom were barely literate, were exhibiting hostile behavior at Quantico during the first days of this general education episode similar to that had previously desolated the educational initiatives of Daniels for the Navy in the pre-War years. Vocational courses focused on civilian equivalent labor skills that would establish each Marine with career training and a marketable skill upon military discharge. The "university" concept at Quantico, compared to West Point and the Naval Academy, encountered success in its endeavor to educate enlisted men and officers in general education and specific civilian equivalent labor skills. M.C.I., along with the establishment of the Educational Section at Headquarters, Marine Corps, institutionalized general education and was a significant part of the history of general education in the Marine Corps.

The Refinement Period (1920-1948)

From 1920 through the depression to the beginning of World War II was a period of stabilization for M.C.I. and Marine Corps general education. During the War, M.C.I.

started to align its mission with new tasks mandated by the requirements and needs of the wartime Marines.

In 1920 M.C.I. was primarily a correspondence school, provided general education and all other extra-military education not directly supporting Marine Corps mission oriented training. M.C.I. reinstituted classroom instruction when the Clerical Schools Detachment was established at Marine Barracks in Washington in 1922-1923. M.C.I. also departed from its policy of voluntary participation in 1923 when all company grade officers were required to enroll in a M.C.I. bookkeeping course. Again in 1924, all officers were enrolled in a foreign language course (French and Spanish). In 1925 M.C.I. the Warrant Officers Preparatory Course for those Marines desiring to matriculate into the newly created rank structure were required to enroll prerequisites in arithmetic, spelling, English grammar and composition, punctuation and capitalization, geography, and U.S. history. Another development occurred in 1928 when M.C.I. established a new department to conduct liaison between M.C.I. and leading commercial and industrial concerns throughout the United States. The purpose of the liaison was to explain to prospective civilian employers the nature and scope of

M.C.I. and the poor opportunity for employment that normally confronted discharged Marines.

M.C.I. had an opportunity to act as a role model for a general education activity for another Service in 1928. The United States Coast Guard began to study various educational methods in 1928 for the purpose of identifying a system that could enlarge their scope of training. The Coast Guard had provided service-related training courses to their men similar to the courses used in the Navy, but now they wanted to offer more general education opportunities to their men.

In 1929 M.C.I. established a complete high school program. The "Standard High School Course" offered a program for four full years of high school study. This was the first effort by the Marine Corps in equivalency education.

During the 1930's M.C.I. was not as dynamic as in its first decade. The 1930's was a period of stability and standardization with enrollments being maintained between four and five thousand students. The process of examination, course completion certification, and issuance of diplomas became institutionalized and many new courses were added and the staff was more than doubled. M.C.I. was not significantly altered during the decade.

In July 1940 before the United States involvement in the widening World War, the Commandant directed M.C.I. to establish a contingency plan favoring all Marines to be ordered to combat duty and only direct mission oriented training be maintained during the duration of the war. On December 8, 1941 all operations of M.C.I. were suspended. M.C.I. was again providing services by the end of January, 1942 and broadened its scope to accommodate the expected increased demand from recruitment for the war effort and complementing courses that supported requirements for warfighting skills training.

Colonel Donald J. Kendall was the last influential leader contributing to general education in the Marine Corps. Beginning in 1944 Kendall monitored a significant shift in the mission of M.C.I. from general education toward MOS training and education. This shift was used as a rationale to maintain the Marine Corps' autonomous correspondence institution, M.C.I. The general education opportunities were then offered by new programs utilizing off-duty time, on-duty time, or in combinations.

Following World War II M.C.I. continued to provide general education and mission oriented training and education to Marines. As the Marine Corps was downsizing the activity of M.C.I. also was reduced. M.C.I. continued

to focus on the changing needs of individual Marines and the Corps with high quality and responsive courses.

The Post-World War II Period (1948-1992)

While M.C.I. was relatively slow to develop as the Marine Corps' first stable general education activity, it had never been threatened from external forces before the end of World War II. With the establishment of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) following World War II, efforts began to economize and reduce duplication in educational programs within the Services. In 1950, the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces, stirred controversy by reporting that M.C.I. and USAFI duplicated functions. However, that same year, the OSD reported that the M.C.I. was a "training" activity of the Marine Corps. This declaration was an effort to thwart any consolidation of M.C.I. and USAFI, preclude any inspections of M.C.I.'s operation, or issuance of any directives that could have impacted on the operation of M.C.I.

The Marine Corps became defensive toward the mission of M.C.I. and this perceived threat. The Marine Corps began to reevaluate policy toward M.C.I., general education programs

and procedures, special education programs, and off-duty education. These actions resulted in a change in general education policy in 1951 by shifting the emphasis of M.C.I. from general education to primarily training associated with military occupational specialties (MOS). The transition of M.C.I. to MOS training was gradual and the gap created was filled by USAFI programs. M.C.I.'s refocused from providing general education for Marines preparing for return to civilian life to assist Marines in improvement of MOS training and proficiency and secondarily receive general education of an academic nature.

In 1953 the autonomy of M.C.I. was threatened again by proposed legislation that would provide authority for OSD to regulate information and education programs within the military Services. M.C.I. expedited its curriculum transition to non-tactical technical training. The Marine Corps, sensing M.C.I. was under siege, began revising the mission and improving the effectiveness of M.C.I. A study indicated that the average knowledge level among all Marines was low, unit training and on-the-job-training (OJT) methods produced only minimum knowledge. The Marine Corps concluded the average knowledge of Marines should be raised and directed M.C.I. to design courses to better prepare technical and "non-tactical" correspondence instruction to

contribute to MOS proficiency of individual Marines. A parallel modification to the Marine Corps Manual transpired by dropping some courses, changing the scope of responsibility for non-tactical correspondence instruction, and modifying procedures for the preparation of M.C.I. courses.

In 1956 the mission of M.C.I. was expanded to include development of all courses in all MOS's, both technical and tactical, to enable Marines to maintain and increase their technical proficiency and prepare for promotion. From 1957 to 1964 the course completion rate increased from 29.2 percent to 45.3 percent while enrollments increased during the same period from 27,000 to 115,000. M.C.I.'s efficiency increased by converting the former manual mechanical method of maintaining records to computer data processing. Today M.C.I. offers 180 courses that provide instruction and training in more than 21 occupational fields for the entire MOS structure of the Marine Corps. There are six non-resident PME programs that parallel the resident programs located at Quantico with 67 courses.

Because of the new M.C.I. mission, control shifted from Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. to the Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia in 1977. A study recommended that emphasis be

placed on the Professional Military Education (PME) courses and further consolidation of the Extension School functions within M.C.I. In 1980 M.C.I. became responsible for all correspondence courses for training and education in the Marine Corps. The PME courses that were incorporated into M.C.I. included the Staff Non-Commissioned Officer, The Basic School, the Amphibious Warfare, and the Marine Corps Command and Staff College Non-resident Programs. The consolidation of the four programs with the 49 subcourses increased M.C.I. enrollment twenty percent to over 129,000 enrollments.

A new concept toward providing general education began to emerge throughout the Department of Defense (DOD): off-duty general education. Off-duty general education opportunities became the alternative for Marines with general education needs. In 1950 Congress began appropriating funding to promote off-duty education, resident off-duty instruction programs, and civilian instructors of off-duty classes established throughout the Marine Corps. A 1951 survey indicated twenty-five per cent of the Marines sampled were involved in off-duty education.

By late 1952 the Marine Corps began to experience increased pressure from DOD to establish off-duty educational programs. The central control and direction of

off-duty education would continue to reside in the Special Services Branch at the Headquarters. Public Law 416 guaranteed the continued existence of the Marine Corps, and this facilitated stable policies and programs for off-duty education through the mid 1950's. World-wide dispersal of Marine units added pressure to off-duty education programs requiring improvements and publication of The Off-Duty Education Manual in 1957. The manual provided Education Officers and Education Assistants with information to organize, plan, supervise, and administer the off-duty education programs. The manual further discussed counselling and testing required in the program. Within the off-duty education category were eight programs to assist individual or groups of Marines to participate in accredited courses in correspondence schools, secondary schools, colleges, and universities by providing partial payment of tuition costs or instructor salaries. In 1961 The Off-Duty Education Manual was replaced by The Marine Education Manual and continued to provide guidance for the off-duty education program and emphasized preparing Marines for the return to civilian life.

The Marine Corps adopted a more aggressive attitude toward education encouraging all commands to explore every possibility of improving the quality and quantity of courses

offered during off-duty time. Driven by huge manpower requirements and the need for basic skills the Marine Corps maintained the policy of encouraging every Marine to obtain a high school diploma and find other skills to personally benefit after they return to civilian life. When funding was available to allow the establishment of pilot programs, the Marine Corps developed programs to enhance recruiting, retention, or the personal development of individual Marines.

The varied off-duty education programs experienced by the Marine Corps included an apprenticeship program in 1977. This program developed in conjunction with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, allowed Marines in MOSs identified as "apprenticeable" to increase proficiency, stimulate retention, and provide recruiting incentives.

The Marine Corps established the College Degree Program to assist career officers in completing college requirements for a baccalaureate degree in 1957, recognizing the benefits to be gained from college education for both the individual career officer and the Corps. This program encouraged and assisted those officers who continued their college education through off-duty studies. The College Degree Program is still in effect with minor changes.

Most billets or specific job positions within the Marine Corps are directed by tables of organization (T/O). In 1963 the Marine Corps began to define and formalize a Special Education Program (SEP) for such T/O billets. The current policy and procedures for SEP further identify and validate the hundreds of billets that are required to be staffed by Marines possessing postgraduate level education. The Advanced Degree Program (ADP) paralleled and augmented the development of SEP program providing an additional method of graduate study for career officers to qualify them for SEP billets. The current policy and procedures for ADP further identify and validate the hundreds of billets that are required to be staffed by Marines possessing postgraduate level education.

The Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program (NESEP) began as an exclusive Navy program; however, in 1958 it provided an opportunity for outstanding enlisted Marines to achieve a career as a Marine Corps officer. In 1973 the Marine Corps established a pilot program for its own enlisted commissioning education program, the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Program (MECEP). Marines participated in technical and non-technical areas of study. MECEP remains available for Marines and the current

instruction also lists the colleges and universities that are open to MECEP.

In 1968 the Marine Corps established a pilot program to provide a source of career non-commissioned officers (NCOs) who possess a high degree of technical competency in certain designated fields--The Marine Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP). MADCOP served to provide an important career retention incentive and increase the technical knowledge of a large number of Marines by providing incentive to pursue college level studies. In 1974 MADCOP was deleted.

The Marine Corps established another degree completion program in 1971 targeting Staff Non-commissioned Officers (SNCOs). The Degree Completion Program for Staff Non-commissioned Officers was established as an incentive for career SNCOs to maintain service in the Marine Corps by assisting them in completing college requirements for baccalaureate degrees.

The Marine Corps participated in other programs that offered applicants the opportunity for advanced education beyond the baccalaureate level. The White House Fellows Program and the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York as an alternate method of obtaining a college degree were examples of these programs.

In the spirit of the Vocational Schools Detachment of 1920, the Marine Corps created the Front Line Series correspondence courses especially for Marines deployed to Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Shield in September 1990. Developed in conjunction with Syracuse University, the series of eight college level correspondence courses were intended to assist Marines in understanding and adapting to the area. This series of independent courses was tailored to the unique educational and practical needs of the deployed Marines, offering a broad orientation to the historical, political, geographic, and psychological traditions of the Middle East.

For more than 70 years the Marine Corps provided opportunities for Marines to attempt academic and vocational courses for both their professional development and to prepare them for the return to civilian life. The Marine Corps has continued to maintain a policy to encourage every Marine to acquire a high school diploma and other skills to benefit and prepare for the return to civilian life.

CONCLUSION

How did general education grow from very marginal status in 1739 to institutional importance within the Marine

Corps today? Major influences appeared in each of the main periods of the Marine Corps' general education history. The Marine Corps shared with the civilian sector, during these periods, an ever increasing reliance on technology and corresponding basic education requirements. The Marine Corps required independence and membership large enough to afford the resources to develop appropriate general education programs and activities to meet its needs.

During the colonial period Marines were provided with the most marginal general education. This marginal status was maintained through the Spanish-American War. Leaders such as Wharton, who published a formal training and education order and established a school for recruits and new officers, Henderson, who established general education schooling for band apprentices as well as Marines desiring to master a basic education, and Heywood, who published the Marine Corps Handbook and initiated the School of Application, directed actions to improve the professionalization of the Marine Corps and institutionalize its training and education. These three early leaders and their contributions provided the basis for Marine Corps general education programs and became a traditional reference as follow-on general education programs and requirements were formulated.[5]

Daniels affected general education activities in the Marine Corps; however, his philosophy was more influential. His Navy University reached every ship and station providing mandatory general education to Navy and Marine Corps personnel. His philosophy of offering everyone an opportunity to receive an education to better themselves and return to the civilian sector as a more capable citizen was a great influence on the Marine Corps' general education program.

Lejeune, in particular, was the most influential leader to affect the general education within the Marine Corps. Lejeune was influenced not only by Daniels' Navy University and philosophy but also the short-lived American Expeditionary Force (AEF) University following World War I in France. Lejeune envisioned a vocational school to provide Marines a means to better themselves and established the Vocational Schools Detachment at Quantico, Virginia in 1919, which became the Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.) in 1920.

Philosophies and visions of individuals such as Daniels and Lejeune founded the Marine Corps training and education programs. Loyal support and execution by others such as Harllee and Kendall substantiated the programs' value and confirmed their practice. M.C.I. was supported by the

Marine Corps as an institution and its growth and popularity resulted from persistent adaptation to need. Increased numbers of courses, adoption of a high school completion program, and opportunity for college accredited courses affirmed its basic philosophy.

After the establishment of the Department of Defense in 1947, the record does not indicate other individuals significantly influencing general education policy or programs within the Marine Corps. A new idea for providing general education began to emerge throughout the Department of Defense (DOD) in 1948: off-duty general education. Off-duty general education opportunities became the alternative for Marines with general education needs. Beginning in 1950 Congressional mandates appropriated funding to promoted off-duty education, resident off-duty instruction programs, and civilian instructors of off-duty classes established throughout the Marine Corps. The continuing influence of technology and the greater education requirement of Marines has propagated the demand for off-duty education programs and activities. Successful general education activities and programs must have the organizations support and resources and be responsive and adaptive to the user.

Lawrence Cremin points out in his final volume of American Education (1988) that during most of the nineteenth

century, military services sponsored "professional education for officers and on-the-job training for enlisted men."[6] By the time of the Civil War, officers received distinctive formal training, primarily by qualified instructors on an undergraduate level, while the enlisted men were instructed by their peers or by non-commissioned officers. The method of training for enlisted men was the time-honored technique of imitation, trial-and-error, and correction and repetition. He also notes that general education for enlisted men under military auspices began on a small scale after the Civil War.[7]

My research supports the evidence observed by Cremin that little was done before the twentieth century for general education of all soldiers, sailors, and Marines in the United States military. Beyond the formal military academy schooling at West Point and Annapolis the military established formal training and education activities such as the Army School of Practice, the School of Artillery, the School of Application for Calvary and Infantry, and the Marine Corps' School for Application as well as professional education activities; the Army and Navy War Colleges. Less formal general education and activities were established such as the Army Post School System.[8] General education was also provided by the Navy's schoolmaster program, and the

Marine Corps Band Apprentice School as well as the Navy Lyceum.[9] Although several established programs were disconnected, non-standard, and all too often limited in their effectiveness and potential, they were further impeded because of the local commander. There were few general education activities during this period.

The changing sophistication of work required general education type programs to close many gaps from the education level of Marines and the education requirement for their job. From the appearance of steam propulsion for ships in the late 1900's and more automatic weapons during World War I the art of warfare began chasing technology. This phenomenon demanded an untiring requirement for training and education. Aircraft, motorized vehicles, and the tactics to coordinate their uses with other modern weapons beginning in the early 1900's demanded continual training. Basic education for the fundamentals of equipment and/or tactics and training to manage the same.

Today's Marine must possess essential mathematical and reading skills to just follow the daily training schedule or to get paid. Most equipment requires basic computer skills to either operate, maintain, or manage. The world of work in the Marine Corps or any United States Armed Service is sophisticated and complex; however, during the evolution of

the Marine Corps the general education activities' purposes have sustained Marines making them suitable to adapt to the ever changing requirements of work.

The Marine Corps continues to provide opportunities for individual Marine to attain academic and vocational education for professional development and preparation for the return to civilian life. Established programs during and after World War II provided opportunities for participating in vocational training, remedial and deficiency courses, academic and vocational high schools, post secondary training, and college and university courses. The non-MOS related training and education opportunities were offered initially during off-duty time; however, programs were developed and evolved to include on-duty time, or in combinations. The Marine Corps has continued to maintain a policy to encourage every Marine to acquire a high school diploma and other skills to benefit and prepare for the return to civilian life.

NOTES

1. Stephen B. Ambrose and James A. Barber, The Military and American Society, (New York: The Free Press, 1972), p. 153.

2. Allan R. Millet, revised, Semper Fidelis: The History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: The Free Press, 1991), 653.

3. "The Marine Corps", New York Sun, June 20, 1898, 20.

4. Millet, 38-39.

5. Ibid, 87-88. Henderson contributed little else to the overall training and education of the Marine Corps because the mission required little more competence than close-order drill and Marine Corps Regulations.

6. Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1870-1980, (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1988), 503-504.

7. Ibid.

8. Bruce White, "ABC's for the American Enlisted Man: The Army Post System", History and Educational Quarterly, Volume VIII, Number 4, 480.

9. S. De Christofar, "The Navy Lyceum," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Volume 77, number 8, August 1951, 869-873.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PUBLISHED MATERIALS

Books and Authors

Ambrose, Stephen B., and James A. Barber, The Military and American Society, (New York: The Free Press, 1972).

Asprey, Robert A., At Belleau Wood, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1965).

Barnard, Henry, Military Schools and Courses of Instruction in the Science and Art of War in France, Prussia, Austria, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, Sardinia, England, and the United States, (New York: E. Steiger New York, 1969).

Barzum, Jacques and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher, (New York: Hartcourt Brace Javanovich Publishers, 1985).

Beach, Edward L., The United States Navy: 200 Years, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1986).

Bierley, Paul E., John Philip Sousa, American Phenomenon, (Columbus: Integrity Press, 1973,).

Borden, Penn,Civilian Indoctrination of the Military, (New York: Greenwood Press, 1898).

Carr, Edwin H., What is History?, (New York: Random House, 1962).

Clark, H. F., and H. S. Sloan, Classrooms in the Military: An Account of Education in the Armed Forces of the United States, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964).

Clifford, Kenneth J., Amphibious Warfare Development in Britain and America from 1920-1940, (Laurous: Englewood, Inc., 1983).

Colby, Elbridge, Education and the Army, (Boston: The Palmer Company, 1922).

Cremin, Lawrence A., American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1870-1980, (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1988).

Cronon, E. David, The Cabinet Diaries of Josephus Daniels 1913-1921, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963).

Daniels, Josephus, Tar Heel Editor, (Westport: Green-wood Pres, Publishers, 1939).

Daniels, Josephus, The Wilson Era: Years of Peace 1910-1917, (Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1944).

Daniels, Jonathan, The End of Innocence, (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972), 129-130.

Daniels, Josephus, Editor in Politics, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941).

Del Valle, Pedro A., Semper Fidelis, (Hawthorne: Christian Book Club of America, 1976).

Elbridge Colby, Education and the Army, (Boston: The Palmer Company, 1922).

Foner, Philip S., Morale Education in the American Army, (New York: International Publishers, 1944).

Grace, Alonzo G., Educational Lessons From Wartime Training, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1948).

Harllee, William C., U. S. Marine Corps Score Book and Rifleman's Instructor, (Philadelphia: International Printing Company, 1913).

Harllee, John, The Marine From Manatee: A Tradition of Rifle Marksmanship, (Washington: National Rifle Association of America, 1984).

Hattendorf, John B., Mitchell Simpson III, and John R. Wadleigh, Sailors and Scholars: The Centennial History of the U.S. Naval War College, (Newport: Naval War College Press, 1984).

Heinl, Robert Debs, Soldiers of the Sea: The United States Marine Corps 1775-1962, (Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1962).

Houle, Cyril O., Elbert W. Burr, Thomas H. Hamilton, and John R. Yale, The Armed Services and Adult Education, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947).

Janowitz, Morris, The Professional Soldier, (New York: The Free Press, 1971).

Kilpatric, Carroll, Roosevelt and Daniels: A Friendship in Politics, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1952).

Krulak, Victor H., First to Fight, (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1948).

Lejeune, John A., The Reminiscence of a Marine, (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, Inc., 1930).

Logan, John A., The Voluntary Soldier of America, (New York: Arno Press, 1979, reprint of Chicago: R.S. Peale, 1887).

Marsak, Leonard M., The Nature of Historical Inquiry, (New York: Holt, Renehart and Winston, 1970), 104.

Masland, J. W., and L.I. Radway, Soldiers and Scholars, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

McClellan, Edwin M., History of the United States Marine Corps, (Washington: Historical Section, Headquarters Marine Corps, 1931).

Merriam, Sharan B., and Edwin L. Simpson, A Guide to Research for Educators and Trainers of Adults, (Malabar: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1989).

Mersky, Peter B., U.S. Marine Corps Aviation: 1912 to the Present, (Baltimore: The Nautical and Aviation Publishing Company of America, 1983).

Metcalf, Clyde H., A History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939).

Millett, Allan R., Semper Fidelis: The History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company Inc., 1980).

Millett, Allan R., and Peter Maslowski, For The Common Defense: A Military History of the United States of America, (New York: Free Press, 1984).

Mitchell, Donald W., History of the Modern American Navy Form 1883 Through Pearl Harbor, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1946).

Mitchell, Donald W., History of the American Modern Navy, (New York: Alfred A. Knoff Inc., 1946).

Moskin, J. Robert, The United States Marine Corps Story, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977).

Murphy, Jack, History of U.S. Marines, (Greenwich: Brompton Book Corporation, 1984).

Nenninger, Timothy K., The Leavenworth Schools and the Old Army, (Westport: Greenwood Press,1978).

Parker, William D., A Concise History of the United States Marine Corps 1775-1969, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1970, 49.

Pierce, Philip N., and Frank O. Hough, The Compact History of the United States Marine Corps, (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1960).

Reason, Peter, and John Rowan, "Issues of Validity in New Paradigm Research," in Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research, (eds,) Peter Reason and John Rowan, (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 1981).

Reeves, Ira L., Military Education in the United States, (Burlington: The Free Press, 1914).

Rowe, Thomas G., Earnest H. Giusti, John H. Johnstone, and Benis M. Frank, A History of Marine Corps Roles and Missions: 1775-1962, (Washington: Historical Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, 1962).

Shelburne, J. C., and K. J. Groves, Education in the Armed Forces, (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965).

Sima, Ripley S., Writing the USAFI Correspondence Course, (Madison: United States Armed Forces Institute, 1960).

Simmons, Edwin H., The United States Marine Corps, (New York: Viking Press, 1976).

Smith, Robert M., G. F. Akers, and J. R. Kidd, Handbook of Adult Education, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970).

Stict, Thomas, Cast-Off Youth: Policy and Training Methods From the Military Experience, (New York: Praeger, 1987).

Trainor, Bernard E., A History of the US Marines, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1981).

Veysey, L. R., The Emergence of the American University, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

Wiener, Philip P., ed., Dictionary of the History of Ideas, Vol II, (New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1973), 464.

Wildes, Harry Emerson, Valley Forge, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1938).

Williams, Robert Hugh, The Old Corps: A Portrait of the U.S. Marine Corps Between the Wars, (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1982).

Wise, Frederick May, A Marine Tells It To You, (New York: J. H. Sears and Company, Inc., 1929).

Books

A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Forces, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1945).

Official Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States, Advising the President and Heads of Department in Relation to the Official Duties, Volume IV, (Washington: Robert Farnham Publishers, 1852).

The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume XII, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

The Ideal of the I.C.S. Fraternity of the World, (Scranton: The Fraternity Supply Company, 1908).

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged, (Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1988).

Government Publications

A Brief History of Marine Corps Officer Procurement, Historical Branch, G-= Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1958.

A Brief History of Marine Corps Recruit Aviation, Historical Branch G-3 Division, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1960.

A Brief History of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island, South Carolina 1891-1962, Historical Branch G-3 Division, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1962.

A History of the U.S. Marine Corps 1775-1952, Historical Branch, G-3 Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1960.

Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Navy for Fiscal Year 1920, (Washington: United States Navy Department, 1920).

Annual Report of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Secretary of the Navy for 1891, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1891).

Barde, Robert E., The History of Marine Corps Competitive Marksmanship, Marksmanship Branch, G-3 Division,

Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1961.

Chambers, C. D., "The Grand Old Man (BGen. Archibald Henderson)", News Release, Release Number 004-87, 1987, United States Marine Corps, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C.

Ellsworth, Harry Allanson, One Hundred Eighty Landings of United States Marines 1800-1934, History and Museums Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, 1975.

Johnson, Edward C. Marine Corps Aviation: The Early Years, History and Museums Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Lejeune, John A., Testimony, U.S. Congress Hearings Before Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives on Estimates Submitted by the Secretary of the Navy 1920, Vol.2. (1821-3420), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1920.

Marine Barracks, Quantico, (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1930).

Marine Corps Manual, (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1953).

Marine Corps Manual, (Washington: U.S. Marine Corps, 1931).

Nolty, Bernard C., United States Marine Corps Ranks and Grades, Historical Reference publication, Historical Division G-3, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington D.C., 1970.

Official Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States, Advising the President and Heads of Department in Relation to the Official Duties, Volume IV, (Washington: Robert Farnham Publishers, 1852).

Parker, William D., A Concise History of the United States Marine Corps 1775-1969, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., 1970.

Quantico: Crossroads of the Corps, (Washington: History and Museum Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1978).

Revised Statutes of the United States 1873-1874, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 217.

Schoundants, Karl, Home of the Commandants, (Washington: History and Museum Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1966).

Smith, Charles R., Marines in the Revolution: A History of the Continental Marines in the American Revolution 1775-1783, (Washington: History and Museum Division, Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, 1975).

The United States Marine Corps in the World War, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920), 71-79.

United States Statutes at Large, V, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1866).

Manuals

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Graduate School Policies and Procedures 1990-91, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1990.

Pamphlets

Front Line Series, (pamphlet from Syracuse University, 1990).

Dissertations

Lawbraugh, Jr., Emanuel S., A Survey of Marine Corps General Education Services, Dissertation, 1972.

Theses

Cross, A. J. Foy, Relative Success in certain Correspondence Courses of Pupils at Various Levels of Mental Ability and Reading Abilities, Thesis presented to University of Nebraska Faculty, June, 1936.

Flood, Thomas H., The United States Marine Corps Institute Since 1938, Thesis, 1948

McIlroy, Jr., Hugh M., The history of the Marine Corps Institute, Thesis, 1986

Pearson, Gaynor, The United States Marine Corps Institute, Thesis, 1938

PERIODICALS

Periodicals with Authors

Cohen, Sol, "The History of the History American Education, 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past", Harvard Educational Review, Volume 46, Number 5, 1976, 303.

Craige, J. H., "Vocational Training in the Marine Corps", Marine Corps Gazette, 1920, 32.

Daniels, Josephus, "Training Our Bluejackets for Peace", The Independent Weekly Magazine, Volume 76, December 11, 1913, 492.

Daniels, Josephus, "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation," Saturday Evening Post, April 9, 1921.

Daniels, Josephus, "The United States Navy," Munsey's Magazine, December, 1917, 585.

Daniels, Josephus, "Making the Navy a Real Training School", Popular Mechanics, New York, N.Y., Vol 20, No.3, September, 1913, 324.

De Christofar, S., "The Navy Lyceum", U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Volume 77, number 8, August 1951, 869-873.

Dunlap, R. H., "Education in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, July, 1921, 153.

Eddy, G. Sherwood, "The American Soldiers in France", The Missionary Review of the World,, March 1918, 207-211.

Foster, Fredrick M., "The Post and Divisional Schools of the A.E.F.", Schools and Society, July 12, 1919, 50-52.

Harter, George A., "The Marine Corps Institute," The Marines Magazine and Indian, September, 1920, 13.

Hughes, Lee, "More than mailorder courses," Marine Corps Gazette, February 1979, 21.

Johnson, Jr., L. F., "The Globe Is Its Campus," The Leatherneck, February 1947, 26.

Langford, Gerald, "Even in a Foxhole," Marine Corps Gazette, June, 1944, 56.

Luvaas, Jay, "The Staff Ride," The Alumni Association Newsletter, U.S. Army War College, Number 25, Summer 1988, 12 and 314.

McClellan, E. N., "From 1783-1798", Marine Corps Gazette, Volume 7, September, 1922, 273-286.

McKelway, Ben, "Studying on the Land and Sea," Trained Men, March-April, 1922, 65-72.

O'Rourke, J. S., Military Leadership for the 1990's and Beyond", Military Review, Vol. 65, 1985, 19.

Porter, J. W., "The Corps' Oldest Post", Marine Corps Gazette, November 1950, 10.

Rohfeld, Rae Wahl, "Preparing World War I Soldiers for Peacetime: The Army University in France," Adult Education Quarterly, Summer 1989, 188.

Ruoff, Fred A., "The Story of a Dream", Marine Corps Gazette, February 1920, 15-23.

Shulimson, Jack, "The Marine Corps School of Application," The Journal Of Military History, October, 1991, 472-473.

Turnbladh, Edwin T., "The Committee on Nova Scotia," Leatherneck, November, 1960, 35.

Walters, Warren S., "Postpaid Training," Marine Corps Gazette, August 1966, 48.

White, Bruce, "ABC's for the American Enlisted Man: The Army Post System", History and Educational Quarterly, Volume VIII, Number 4, Winter 1968.

Williams, Dion, "The Education of A Marine Officer," Marine Corps Gazette, August, 1933, 17.

Willock, Roger, Biographical Sketch, "Major Smedley Darlington Butler, USMC, (Ret)", prepared for The American Council of Literary Society, Dictionary of American Biography, June 1956.

Periodicals

"Airlift to Gulf: Homework and Pencils," New York Times, Wednesday, 28 November 1990, B9.

"All Company Officers To Take MCI Courses," The Leatherneck, March 17, 1923, 1.

"All Work To Be Cut Out After Dinner And Time Given To Athletics and Education," The Leatherneck, 21 November, 1919, 1.

"Army to Take Over Educational Work", Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 3.

"Bulletin Number 1," The Leatherneck, June 11, 1920, 4.

"Colonel Harllee Departs Quantico," The Leatherneck, July 10, 1920, 4-6.

"Colonel Harllee On Tour For U.S. M.C.I.," The Leatherneck, July 17, 1920, 1 and 3.

"Colonel Harllee Speaks Out At The School Meeting," The Leatherneck, April 9, 1920, 1.

"Complete High School Education Offered," The Leatherneck, July 14, 1928, 29.

"Correspondence College Opens to A.E.F. Aspirants", Stars and Stripes, March 21, 1919, 2.

"Educators In Quantico To Visit Schools," The Leatherneck, March 12, 1920, 1.

"Entries in New Classes Surpass Expectations," The Leatherneck, 5 December, 1919, 1.

"Examinations in Language Courses," The Leatherneck, February 7, 1925, 12.

"Expert Teachers Have Been Secured First Term to End March Thirteenth," The Leatherneck, 26 November, 1919, 1.

"Free Education While You Wait for Orders Home", Stars and Stripes, December 6, 1918, 1.

"General Lejeune Outlined Plan For The School System," The Leatherneck, February 20, 1920, 1.

"Generals Lejeune and Butler Visit Scranton," The Leatherneck, April 2, 1920, 1.

"Government May Open Universal Training School", Stars and Stripes, May 23, 1919, 1.

"Head Of Commercial Department, I.C.S., Speaks,", The Leatherneck, April 27, 1920, 1.

"Here Is Your Chance To Learn A Very Good Trade," and "Post Special Order Number 299," The Leatherneck, 2 January, 1920, 1.

"In the trenches college classes to allay boredom," The Boston Globe, Monday, 26 November 1990, 31, 35.

"Marine Corps Institute Clerical Schools Detachment," The Leatherneck, January 13, 1923, 1.

"Marine Corps Vacancies," Army and Navy Journal, March 11, 1899, 647.

"Marine Institute Sends Teachers To Help Men Continue Studies," The Leatherneck, May 14, 1920, 1.

"Marine Corps Institute Branch Popular With Men of the Sixteenth Regiment," The Leatherneck, May 28, 1920, 3.

"Marine Corps Institute Diplomas," The Leatherneck, June 4, 1920, 3.

"MCI Establishes Contact with Employers for Institute Graduate," The Leatherneck, July, 1928, 33.

"Military Education in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, June 1921, 230.

"Military Schooling in the Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, March 1922, 23-24.

"Mobilizing the Y.M.C.A.", The Literary Digest, May 19, 1917, 1504.

"Mr. Lawrence Visits Institute," The Leatherneck, May 28, 1920, 3.

"Naval Affairs Committee Learns of Quantico Schools," The Leatherneck, February 27, 1920, 1.

"Of Interest To Recruiters," The Leatherneck, May 14, 1920, 3, and Harter, 20.

"Officers School at Quantico," Marine Corps Gazette, March, 1920, 113-115.

"Our First Graduate," The Leatherneck, May 21, 1920, 3.

"Petty Officers' School," Army and Navy Journal, August 24, 1901, 1270.

"Popularity of the Marine Corps," Army and Navy Journal, March 21, 1908, 781.

"Post Schools Open With An Enrollment of 360 Students," The Leatherneck, 9 January, 1920, 1.

"Postwar Pattern of A Marine," The Leatherneck, May, 1943, 50 and 53.

"Press and Public Commend Institute Latest Feature of Marine Training," Recruiters' Bulletin, July, 1920, 3-4.

"Proves Well Adopted to Service Conditions," The Leatherneck, October 30, 1920, 1.

"Queries About United States Marine Corps Institute," The Leatherneck, April 16, 1920, 1.

"Reorganization of the United States Marine Corps," Marine Corps Gazette, December, 1920, 415-417.

"School Here To Use I.C.S. Text Books in its Courses," The Leatherneck, February 6, 1920, 1.

"The Marine Corps," Army and Navy Journal, August 19, 1899, 1209.

"The Development of MCS," Marine Corps Gazette, September, 1954, 36-38.

"The Service With a Future," (Touring Posts for M.C.I.), Recruiters Bulletin, August, 1920, 7.

"The Marine Corps Schools," Marine Corps Gazette, December, 1920, 407.

"The Post Automobile School Monday With A Record Attendance," The Leatherneck, 12 December, 1919, 1.

"The Quantico Barrage," The Marines Magazine and Indian, December, 1920, 10.

"The Marine Corps Institute for 1922," The Leatherneck, January 6, 1922, 1.

"The Quantico Schools," Marine Corps Gazette, September, 1920, 316.

"The U.S. Coast Guard and Education," The Leatherneck, December, 1928, 10.

"Warrant Officer Preparatory Course," The Leatherneck, February 7, 1925, 12.

"Weekly Report of U.S. Marine Corps Institute, October 5, 1920," The Leatherneck, November 6, 1920, 6.

"Will Start To Recruit For Schools Here," The Leatherneck, March 26, 1920, 1.

Untitled article, Army and Navy Journal, January 23, 1909, 567.

Untitled article, Army and Navy Journal, May 13, 1899, 862.

Untitled article, Army and Navy Journal, January 11, 1902, 461.

Newspapers

"150,000 in A.E.F. Enroll for Work in Post Schools", Stars and Stripes, March 7, 1, 3.

"50,000 Soldiers Respond to A.E.F.'s Own School Call", Stars and Stripes, January 7, 1919, 1

"A.E.F. Vocational Training Plan is Outlined in General Order", Stars and Stripes, February 14, 1919, 3.

"A.E.F. University at Beaune Nears End of Only Term", Stars and Stripes, May 16, 1919, 1

"Airlift to Gulf: Homework and Pencils," New York Times, Wednesday, 28 November 1990, B9.

"Army to Take Over Educational Work", Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 3

"Correspondence College Opens to A.E.F. Aspirants", Stars and Stripes, March 21, 1919, 2

"Free Education While You Wait for Orders Home", Stars and Stripes, December 6, 1918, 1.

"Government May Open Universal Training School", Stars and Stripes, May 23, 1919, 1

"In the trenches college classes to allay boredom," The Boston Globe, Monday, 26 November 1990, 31, 35.

"Marines to Go SU-in Desert," The Post-Standard, Syracuse, Thursday, 20 September 1990, A-1, A-8.

"Soldiers Lecture to A.E.F. Students on Farming Topics", Stars and Stripes, 2.

"SU's Classroom In Desert Draws Reinforcements," The Post Standard, Syracuse, Thursday, 29 November 1990, A1-A8.

"Tenth of Third Army is going to School", Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 2.

"The Mariners", Manchester Union, March 18, 1875, 10.

"The Marine Corps", New York Sun, June 20, 1898, 20.

"The Marine Corps", New York Sun, June 20, 1898, 20.

"The Post and Divisional Schools of the A.E.F.", Schools and Society, July 12, 1919, 50-52

"Thousands Flock to Beaune for University Work", Stars and Stripes, March 7, 1919, 1.

"U. of Beaune is Due to Close on June 7", Stars and Stripes, May 9, 1919, 4.

Untitled article Stars and Stripes, December 6, 1918, 3.

Untitled article Stars and Stripes, January 7, 1919, 1.

Untitled article Stars and Stripes, April 4, 1919, 1, and 3.

Untitled article Stars and Stripes, April 5, 1919, 1

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

"Major General Charles Heywood United States Marine Corps", U.S. Marine Corps Historical Center, Navy Yard, Washington, D.C., November, 1949.

"Military Efficiency," Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Order Number 1620, (Series 1920), (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1920).

Chambers, C. D., "The Grand Old Man (BGen. Archibald Henderson)", News Release, Release Number 004-87, 1987,

United States Marine Corps, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C.

Dallas, Alexander S., Commodore, Records of USS Constellation, June 1836, Records Group 149, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

CMC Washington DC message ALMAR 240/83 (022349Z NOV 83), Subj: Achievement of 90 Percent Completion Rate for the Marine Corps Institute (M.C.I.) Programs.

Daniels, Josephus, General Order No. 53, Secretary of the Navy, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1913, 1.

Education of the Corps, a report of the Marine Corps Education Study Panel, unpublished report for the Commandant of the Marine Corps, 1971, 4-5, 4-6, 4-18.

Form 30-D, 1885, Record Group 109, National Achieves, Washington, D.C.

General Order Number 22, April 7, 1866, War Department Adjutant General Office, Washington, D.C.

Headquarters Order 1500.5C, Subj: Marine Corps Training Program for Billets with Special Education Prerequisites, AO1E-3-mas, 11 August 1967.

Headquarters Order 1500.10A, Subj: Administrative Procedures for Billets with Enlisted College Level Education Prerequisites, MPC-54-sjb, 28 April 1982.

Headquarters Order 1500.10, Subj: Administrative Procedures for Identification and Validation of Enlisted College Level Education Billets, MPC-54:jmb, 5 March 1975.

Headquarters Marine Corps All Marine Corps (ALMAR) Message 171613Z Feb 58, From Commandant of the Marine Corps to ALMAR, 17 February 1958 and Memorandum from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program, AO3C-ccp, 7 March 1958.

Headquarters Marine Corps All Marine Corps (ALMAR) Message 050016Z Nov 74, From Commandant of the Marine Corps to ALMAR, MCBUL 1560 Marine Corps Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP), 16 February 1974.

Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, 1975, 1140-1143.

HQMC News Release (Washington: Headquarters, Marine Corps, 1948).

Information Paper by M. G. Spiese, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MRRO-6r, 2 December 1986.

Major General Commandant, Third Endorsement of "Supplemental Report, Brigade Commander Advance Base Expedition, Calebra, January-February 1914," Record Group 432, Naval History Division, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

Marine Corps Order 1560.21B, Subj: Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, OTTE-40-cls, 11 March 1977.

Marine Corps Order 1560.21, Subj: Degree Completion Program for Staff Noncommissioned Officers, DX:af, 13 July 1971.

Marine Corps Order 1560.7 with Changes 1, 2, and 3, Subj: College Degree Program, AO1-jlj, 5 March 1956 (Ch. 1, 22 May 1958, Ch. 2, 24 October 1958, and Ch. 3, 20 May 1959).

Marine Corps Order 1560.8, Subj: Evaluation of Service training in terms of academic credit, 19 January 1957.

Marine Corps Order 1560.15J, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MRRO-6a, 1 October 1984.

Marine Corps Order 1560.22, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP) (Pilot Program), DX-NJL-gjs, 12 April 1973.

Marine Corps Order 1550.22A, Subj: U.S. Marine Corps Apprenticeship Program, TRI91-plc, 11 February 1981.

Marine Corps Order 1500.48, Subj: Administrative Procedures for Billets with Enlisted College Level Education Prerequisites, MPC-59, 1 May 1989.

Marine Corps Order 1560.15, Subj: Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program for enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps, DPB-pjh, 24 June 1960.

Marine Corps Order 1560.15B, Subj: Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program for Enlisted Personnel of the Marine Corps, DPB-leg, 10 August 1965.

Marine Corps Order, 1560.16, Subj: Marine Corps Education Manual, 4 January 1961.

Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: White House Fellows Program, DX, 20 October 1971.

Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: Regents External Degree Program, DX:JH:mec, 21 February 1973.

Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP), MMRO-6o, 3 August 1988.

Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., Unit Diary Number 197-54, (18 October 1954).

Marine Corps Order 1560.19C, Subj: Advanced Degree Program (ADP), MMOA-3-MM-rjn, 8 September 1981.

Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Subj: Improving the Quality of the Education and Transition Programs, 15 March 1973.

Marine Corps Bulletin 1560, Subj: White House Fellows Program, DSL-dw, 15 September 1966.

Marine Corps Order 1500.9E, Subj: Special Education Program (SEP), MMOA-3-MM-clw, 28 June 1983.

Marine Corps Order 1560.7H, Subj: College Degree Program, TDE-44, 17 April 1986.

Marine Corps Order 1560.19B, Subj: Advanced Degree Program, DX:LCM:gjs, 15 February 1973.

Marine Corps Institute Order P1550.1Q, Volume II, (1981).

Marine Corps General Order Number 1, May 1, 1891, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

Memorandum for the Under Secretary of the Navy from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Special Education Program for Marine Recruits (Slow Learners), 21 September 1965.

Memorandum for the Under Secretary of the Navy from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Special Education Program for Marine Recruits (Slow Learners), 21 September 1965.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (P&RF) from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, Subj: Obligated Service in Return for Subsidized Education, CPTC/D-10, 8 October 1956.

Memorandum for Record, from Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps, Subj: Approved Postgraduate Education Requirements, AO1A-kb, 22 April 1963.

Memorandum on AO3 comment on Personnel Department Route Sheet, DX-dlc of 6 November 1968, Subj: Review and Evaluation of Armed Forces Adult Education Programs, AO3C50-clb, 1500, 15 November 1968.

Memorandum from Acting Secretary of the Navy, September 26, 1912, National Archives, Record Group 109.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (personnel and Reserve Forces), Subj: Recommendations for the use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, DSL-2420-mlw, 29 January 1957.

Memorandum from Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, to Chief of Staff, G-3, Subj: Responsibility for Education and Information matters, ACSC-yms, 28 November 1952.

Memorandum from the Head, Policy Analysis Division to Chief of Staff, G-3, 8 December 1952.

Muster Roll for Marine Barracks, Quantico, Virginia, for the period 1 July to 31 July, 1920, Historical Division, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

Muster Roll for Marine Corps Institute Detachment, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., for the period 1 November

to 30 November, 1920, Historical Division, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

Muster Roll for Marine Barracks, Quantico, Virginia, for the period 1 April to 30 April, 1920, Historical Division, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

Muster Rolls 1857, Marine Barracks, Washington D.C., Record Group 109, National Archives.

Muster Roll of Officer and Enlisted Men of the United States Marine Corps, Barracks Detachment, Marine Barracks Quantico, Virginia, for the Period December 1 to December 31, 1919, Marine Corps Historical Division, Washington, D.C.

News release from the Navy News Bureau, Washington, D.C. January 24, 1920. Secretary of the Navy Daniels authorized the news release.

News release from the Navy News Bureau, Washington, D.C. January 24, 1920.

Off-Duty Education Manual, U.S. Marine Corps, NAVMC 1143-PD, 28 February 1957, 1-2.

Post Special Order No. 10-1945, 2 February 1945 (regarding the Pacific Branch of M.C.I.).

Survey of Interest in Off-Duty Education, Prepared by the Procedures Analysis Office, Office of the Director of Personnel, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, November 1951, 1 and 5.

LECTURES, PRESENTATIONS, AND SPEECHES

"Kinsfolk," copy of a presentation from International Correspondence School to William Harllee, Scranton, Pa., 1935, Historical Branch, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

Preston, Richard A., "Perspectives in the History of Military Education and Professionalism", The Harmon Memorial Lectures in Military History, Number 22, United States Air Force Academy, 1980, 6.

"The Federal Program of Education in Mexico," draft of a speech 15 July 1929, Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress.

Trainor, Bernard E., "A History of Marine Corps School," Text of a Speech, Delivered on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Post Quantico, Virginia, 13 May 1967, 1-4.

OFFICIAL LETTERS

Archibald Henderson, Official letter, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., November 18, 1923.

Archibald Henderson, Official Letter, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, December 13, 1839.

Archibald Henderson, Official letter, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., October 22, 1849.

Archibald Henderson, Official letter, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., November 12, 1857,

Major General Commandant Heywood, Official Letter to W. H. Moody, September 22, 1903, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Washington D.C., National Achieves, Record Group 127.

Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., Unit Diary Number 197-54, (18 October 1954).

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools and the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-mw/20 September 1958), Subj: Consolidation of the Training and Education Unit with the Marine Corps Institute.

Official letters from the Commandant of the Marine Corps (3A/afg/11 January 1965), 2., Commanding Officer, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (30:BLH:peb/3 February 1966), (30:MJM:peb/22 December 1966), and (30:MJM:bjh/28 February 1968), Subj: Command Chronology.

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-jmg/19 May 1958), Subj: Reorganization of Marine Corps correspondence training.

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-pwh/17 July 1961), Subj: Mission and Functions of the Marine Corps Institute.

Official letter Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-mrh/8 December 1953), Subj: Mission and curriculum of the Marine Corps Institute and related matters.

Official letter, from Assistant Chief of Staff G-3 to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (AO3C-hvk/18 June 1953), regarding changing functions of M.C.I.

Official letter from Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-hvk/24 August 1953), Subj: Mission of the Marine Corps Institute and Marine Corps Manual, (Washington: United States Marine Corps, 1953), 18 and Official letter from Director of M.C.I. to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, (D-459-whd/Ser 1146/3 September 1953), Subj: Change in Marine Corps Institute mission.

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools and the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-mek/16 January 1964), Subj: Instructional Course Material issued by Extension School and the Marine Corps Institute.

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AO3C-wrt/10 September 1956), Subj: Curriculum of the Marine Corps Institute.

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of M.C.I., (AS-3-23/mkm/#633/5 January 1971), Subj: GAO Report to Congress on Management Improvements Needed at the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI).

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Judge Advocate General, Subj: Navy and Marine Corps Personnel Instruction at Civilian Institutions, proposed legislation for, DB-311-mfw, 11 July 1951.

Official letter from P. J. Rulon, Professor of Education, Harvard University Graduate School of Education to the Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, 8 December 1952 and Official letter from the Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Subj: P. J. Rulon, Professor of Education, Harvard University, visit at Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C., WKM:erm, A20, 6 January 1953.

Official letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Judge Advocate General, 11 July 1951.

Official letter from the Head, Personnel Plans & Programs Branch, to the Assistance Chief of Staff, G-1, Headquarters of the Marine Corps, Subj: Establishment of an Enlisted Career Education Plan; Marine Associated Degree Completion Program (MADCOP), AO1C/dmp-21, 30 June 1967 and Point paper, Subject: Establishment of a Marine Associated Degree Completion Program (MADCOP) as a part of the Enlisted Career Education Plan, AO1C/jef-21, 30 June 1967.

Official letter from the Director of Personnel, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, via the Director Plans and Policies, Subj: Improvement of off-duty educational facilities at posts and stations within the Marine Corps, DSL-1581-alh, 3 December 1951 and The Endorsement on the Director of Personnel letter,DSL-1581-alh, 3 December 1951 to CMC, AO-1-hmh, 7 January 1952.

Official letter from Commanding Officer, Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., (3A:DMO:raa/5750/31 March 1981), Subj: Command Chronology.

Official letter from Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (C 03/1500/19 January 1978), Subj: Command Chronology.

Official correspondence, Memorandum from Head, Promotion Branch, Colonel E. P. Foley to Director of Personnel (DHC-1839-hwm/6 March 1953), regarding promotion testing.

Official letter from Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (C 03/1500/19 January 1981), Subj: Command Chronology.

Official letters from the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, (3A/afg/11 January 1965), Subj: Instructional Course Material issued by Extension School and the Marine Corps Institute, from the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Commandant of Marine Corps Schools, (AO3C-mek/10 February 1965), Subj: Instructional Course Material issued by Extension School and the Marine Corps Institute, and from the Director of M.C.I. to the Officer-In-Charge, Course preparation Section, (HQ:JJJ:mlg/11 March 1965), Subj: Liaison with Extension School.

Official letter from Assistant Chief of Staff G-3 to Commandant of the Marine Corps (AO3C-huk/18 June 1953), Enclosure (1), regarding missions and functions of the Marine Corps Institute.

Official Letter from the honorable William Kettner (House of Representatives, California 11th District), to Major General J. H. Pendleton, Washington, D. C., March 6, 1920.

Official Letter from Major J. C. Fegan to Brigadier General S. D. Butler., U.S. Marine Corps, Western Recruiting Division, Los Angles, Ca., August 25, 1920.

Official Letter, Major General Commandant to all Officers and Man of the Recruiting Services, Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., November 12,1920, Subject: "The Marine Corps Institute".

Official Letter from Major General Commandant George Barnett to Major General Lejeune, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., February 10, 1920, 1, 3.

Official Letter from General S. D. Butler, January 13, 1920.

Official Letter from General S. D. Butler to Secretary Daniels, Quantico, Va., January 13, 1920.

Official Letter from the Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels to General S. D. Butler, Washington, D.C. January 10, 1920. Daniels was also interested in announcing the new schools to newspapers to aid Marine Corps recruiting.

Official Letter from General S. D. Butler, January 13, 1920.

Official Letter from Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels to Lieutenant Colonel William Harllee, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C., December 1, 1920.

Official Letter from Lieutenant Colonel William Harllee to Brigadier S. D. Butler, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., December 2, 1920.

Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (Serial MC-308924/2 September 1944), regarding Commandant of the Marine Corps approval of M.C.I. recommendations.

Official letter from Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Director of Marine Corps Institute, (AOC3-mja/31 March 1952), Subj: Educational Assistance for Recruit Training Programs and Specialist Training Courses.

Official letter from the Director of Marine Corps Institute to Commandant of the Marine Corps, (AD-459-op/Ser: 921-53/10 Mar 1953), Subj: Recommendation of Marine Corps Institute Mission, request for. (Colonel Jack Juhan, Director M.C.I.

Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (Serial 151521/5 February 1943) regarding liaison with USAFI.

Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (Serial MC-162034/9 December 1943), regarding assignment of Women Reserves.

Official Letter, Major General Commandant to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (1520-30-80-10/A0-277-WRA/5 July, 1940), Subject: Operations Plan for Suspension of the Marine Corps Institute.

Official letter from Director of Personnel to Chief of Staff (10 March 1953), Subj: Marine Corps Institute:

affects of proposed permanent legislation for Information and Education on.

Official Letter, Marine Corps Institute to Major General Commandant, (263/BP/emf/12 Jan 1942), regarding reopening of the M.C.I., Official Letter, Major General Commandant to Director, Marine Corps Institute, (2385/7-835/AO-277-pjd/19 Jan 1942), regarding reopening of the M.C.I.

Official Letter, Commandant of the Marine Corps, (Code A&I), to Director, Marine Corps Institute (2387/7-835/AD-31-1c/23 Jan 1942), Subject: Authorized allowance and Official Letter Commandant of the Marine Corps to Director Marine Corps Institute (Serial MC-80013/26 January 1943) regarding allowance of personnel.

William W. Burrows, Official letter Headquarters Marine Corps, 16 July, 1799, to John Rutledge, Jr. Senator from Charleston, S.C., Marine Corps Historical Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

Letters

Letter from Judge of Court of Appeals, Denver Colorado, January 10. 1914 and notes dated 1914 by Daniels found in Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress.

Letter from Walter C. Erwin to Marine Corps Institute, February 28, 1938.

Letters, notes, and telegrams found in Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress.

Notes

Notes and briefing papers on Marine Corps Institute from 1964, unpublished papers provided by Colonel Hazel Benn, USMC (Ret), from her private papers.

Notes and draft of "Training Men for the Navy and the Nation," Joseph Daniels Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Notes dated 1913 by Daniels found in Josephus Daniels collection Library of Congress. The notes described the idea to invite qualified college students to study aboard battleships a few weeks in the summer each year.

Notes written by Josephus Daniels in early 1920, Josephus Daniels Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS

Bittner, Donald F. Curriculum Evolution: Marine Corps Command and Staff College 1920-1988, Unpublished paper, 1989, 1.

Frances, Anthony, A History of Marine Corps Schools, unpublished paper, 1945

Reichelt, William E. From Ship to Shore: The Evolution of United States Marine Corps Roles and Missions, Unpublished Paper, 1977, 9.

INTERVIEWS

Benn, Hazel, Colonel, USMC, Ret. Former Director of Marine Corps Education.

Hendrix, Hadys D., Marine combat veteran of World War I

Long, Richard, Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

Smith, Charles R., Marine Corps Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

Weiss, Sydell, Director of Marine Corps Education, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

INTERVIEW GUIDE

The strategy for the questions used in the interviews were developed as a means to find answers not available from the other sources. The design for the questions patterned guidelines and suggestions by Merriam and Simpson (1989) in A Guide to Research for Educators and Trainers of Adults.

Thank you for agreeing to this interview that I am conducting as a part of the data collection phase of my doctoral dissertation.

The purpose of my interview is to seek to identify how general education came about in the Marine Corps according to several specific periods spanning from the colonial period of 1739 to 1992.

I will take notes of your responses and you may review my noted and make any comments.

I would like to use your name in the introduction chapter of my dissertation and in the bibliography.

QUESTIONS

My first question is, how did general education come about in the Marine Corps according from the colonial period of 1739 to 1992?

In your opinion, what is the most significant general education activities during the history of the Marine Corps?

How were Marines trained prior to institutional training and education programs? Was there any standardization?

PROBES

In your opinion, which individuals, if any, stand out as contributors to the establishment of general education activities during the history of the Marine Corps?

Are you aware of any letters, memorandum, directives, orders, or any other official documentation that will provide other information concerning

In your experience, how, if at all, have these general education programs been accepted?

(OTHER PROBES DEVELOPED AS THE INTERVIEWS PROGRESSED)

APPENDIX B

MARINE CORPS YEAR END STRENGTHS

MARINE CORPS YEAR END STRENGTHS

YEAR	OFFICERS	ENLISTED	TOTAL	COMMENTS
1775-1783	231	c.2,000	2,231	ESTIMATED
	124	c.3,000	3,124	WAR PEAK 1779
1794	6	306	312	AUTHORIZED FOR 6 FRIGATES ONLY
1798	33	848	881	ESTABLISHMENT AUTHORIZATION 11 JUL 1798
1799	40	954	994	
1803	26	453	479	EXECUTIVE ORDERS OF JEFFERSON 14 FEB 1803
1809	45	1,753	1,798	AUTHORIZATION BY 1812 ONLY 38 OFFICERS ON DUTY
1814	93	2,622	2,715	WAR OF 1812
1817	50	865	915	PEACE ESTABLISHED ACT
1829	49	948	997	
1834	59	1,224	1,283	REORGANIZATION ACT
1847	71	2,319	2,390	MEXICAN WAR
1851	67	1,154	1,221	
1855	53	1,338	1,391	INCREASED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER
1856	53	1,538	1,591	INCREASED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

YEAR	OFFICERS	ENLISTED	TOTAL	COMMENTS
1857	53	1,778	1,831	INCREASED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER
1858	53	2,010	2,063	INCREASED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER
1861	93	3,074-4,074	3,167-4,167	CIVIL WAR AND EXECUTIVE ORDER
1876	75	2,074	2,149	
1878	84	2,000	2,084	
1889	77	2,100	2,177	
1896	76	2,600	2,676	
1898	119	4,713	4,832	INCLUDING AN INCREASE OF 43 OFFICERS AND 1,640 ENLISTED, FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR SERVICE ONLY
1899	201	6,062	6,263	NAVAL PERSONNEL BILL 1899
1902	201	6,812	7,013	
1903	278	7,532	7,810	
1905	278	8,771	9,049	
1908	333	9,521	9,854	
1912	351	9,921	10,272	
1916	381	9,947	10,328	
	649	14,981	15,630	NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT AUTHORIZATION (ACTUAL 354 OFFICERS, 10,727 ENLISTED)

YEAR	OFFICERS	ENLISTED	TOTAL	COMMENTS
1917	649	17,400	18,049	INCLUDED WARRANT OFFICER GRADES
	1,325	30,000	31,325	WW I AUTHORIZATION (ACTUAL 511 OFFICERS, 13,214 ENLISTED ON 6 APR 1917 WHEN WAR WAS DECLARED. 776 OFFICERS, 26,973 ENLISTED WERE ON DUTY 30 JUNE 1917).
1918	4,024	75,000	79,024	AUTHORIZATION (ACTUAL 1,503 OFFICERS, 51,316 ENLISTED ON DUTY 30 JUNE 1918, 1,474 OFFICERS, 70,489 ENLISTED ON DUTY 11 NOV 1918, PEAK WAS 74,788).
1919	1,270	46,564	47,834	
1920	1,097	27,400	28,497	AUTHORIZATION (ACTUAL 16,061)
1921	1,087	21,903	22,990	
1927	1,198	18,000	19,198	
1933	1,192	15,343	16,535	
1939	1,354	18,052	19,406	
	1,568	25,000	26,568	AUTHORIZED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER 8 SEP 1939
1941	3,339	51,020	54,539	
	4,106	66,319	70,425	7 DEC 1941
1942	7,138	135,475	142,613	

YEAR	OFFICERS	ENLISTED	TOTAL	COMMENTS
1943	21,384	287,139	308,523	
	14,549	391,620	406,169	31 DEC 1943
1944	32,788	442,816	475,604	
1945	37,067	437,613	474,680	
	37,664	485,113	522,777	PEAK OF WORLD WAR II
1946	14,208	141,471	155,679	
1947	7,506	85,547	93,053	
1948	6,907	78,081	84,988	
1949	7,250	78,715	85,965	
1950	7,254	67,025	74,279	KOREA WAR ON-BOARD 30 JUN 1950
1951	15,150	177,770	192,920	
1952	16,413	215,544	231,957	
1953	18,731	230,488	249,219	END OF KOREAN WAR
1954	18,593	205,275	223,868	
1955	18,417	186,753	205,170	
1956	17,809	182,971	200,780	
1957	17,434	183,427	200,861	
1958	16,471	172,754	189,495	
1959	16,065	159,506	175,571	
1960	16,203	154,418	170,621	
1961	16,132	160,777	176,909	
1962	16,861	174,101	190,962	
1963	16,737	172,946	189,683	

YEAR	OFFICERS	ENLISTED	TOTAL	COMMENTS
1964	16,843	172,934	189,777	
1965	17,258	172,955	190,213	
1966	20,512	241,204	261,716	
1967	23,592	261,677	285,269	
1968	24,555	282,697	307,252	
1969	25,698	284,073	309,771	PEAK OF VIETNAM WAR
1970	24,941	234,796	259,737	
1971	21,765	190,604	212,369	
1972	19,843	178,395	198,238	
1973	19,282	176,816	196,098	
1974	18,740	170,062	188,802	
1975	18,591	177,360	195,951	
1976	18,882	173,517	192,399	
1977	18,650	173,057	191,707	
1978	18,388	172,427	190,815	
1979	18,229	167,021	185,250	
1980	18,198	170,271	188,469	
1981	18,363	172,257	190,620	
1982	18,975	173,405	192,380	
1983	19,983	174,106	194,089	
1984	20,366	175,848	196,214	
1985	20,175	177,850	198,025	

YEAR	OFFICERS	ENLISTED	TOTAL	COMMENTS
1986	20,199	178,615	198,814	
1987	20,047	179,478	199,525	
1988	20,079	177,271	197,350	
1989	20,099	176,857	196,956	
1990	19,958	176,694	196,652	
1991	19,753	174,287	194,040	
1992	19,132	165,397	184,529	BUDGETARY REQUIREMENTS AND UNEXPECTED LOSS PATTERN

Programs and Budget Section, Manpower Plans and Policy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX C

DISTRIBUTION OF MARINE OFFICERS IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

MARINE CORPS STUDENT DISTRIBUTION

DISTRIBUTION OF MARINE OFFICERS IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

MARINE CORPS STUDENT DISTRIBUTION

ARMY	06/05	05	05/04	04	04/03	03	03/02	02	02/01	01
GENERAL SERVICE SCHOOLS										
The School of the line, Ft. Leavenworth, KS		2	2							
The General Staff School, Ft. Leavenworth, KS	1	1	1							
The Army War College, Washington, D.C.	1	1								
SPECIAL SERVICE SCHOOLS										
The Motor Transport School, Camp Holabird, MD							1	1		
The Engineer School, Camp A.A. Humphreys, VA										
The Signal Corps School, Camp Alfred Vail, NJ								1		
The Chemical Warfare School, Edgewood Arsenal, MD								1	1	
The Field Artillery School, Ft. Sill, OK										
1. Field Officers' Course			1	1						
2. Company Officers' Course							2			
The Infantry School, Camp Benning, GA										
1. Field Officers' Course		1	1	1						
2. Company Officers' Course							2			
The Tank School, Camp Meade, MD										
The Air Service Pilot School, Caristrom Field, Arcadia, FL										
NAVY										
The Naval War College, Newport, RI	1	1	2							
Aviation School, N.A.S. Pensacola, FL			1		2		1	17		
The Post Graduate Course										
(a) Annapolis, MD (School of Aerodynamics)						2				
(b) Mass. Inst. of Tech. (School of Aerodynamics						1				
(c) George Wash. University (School of Law)				1		1		1		
NOTE: Officers are assigned to duty in office of Judge Advocate General										
MARINE CORPS										
Marine Corps Schools										
1. Field Officers' School		2	4	10	5					
2. Company Officers' School							30			
3. Basic School										*

* All newly appointed 2nd Lieutenants should take the Basic Course.

NOTE: When alternate grades are indicated, only senior officers of the lower grades should be detailed.

06=COLONEL/05=LIEUTENANT COLONEL/04=MAJOR/03=CAPTAIN/02=FIRST LIEUTENANT/01=SECOND LIEUTENANT

68

APPENDIX D

TIME LINE OF MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION

TIME LINE OF MARINE CORPS GENERAL EDUCATION

This appendix provides a chronology of information on activities and individuals that directly or indirectly support the establishment, maintenance, and/or philosophical basis for general education with the United States Marine Corps.

1739 Gooch's Marines - the only training and education was drill and marksmanship, there was no general education.

1763 The "Original Eight's" Marines - again, the only training and education was drill and marksmanship.

1775 Continental Marines - the training and education included drill marksmanship, and landing party raid training was introduced. General education was not recorded.

Military training and education in colonial America was imported directly from Europe by the deployed imperial forces stationed in the North America. As the colonies began to band together to defend their new homeland European officers and soldiers were commissioned to establish the core of militia and to train the colonists. European military training and education influence was present. During the Revolutionary War, the need for trained and educated leaders, organizers, disciplinarians, and teachers was met by conferring positions of military rank in functional areas to educated and experienced foreign soldiers. Some of these soldier/educators included Major General Johann DeKalb of Germany, Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski of Poland, Brigadier General Thaddeus Kosciusko of Poland, and Major General Marquis de Lafayette of France.

1777 General education in the United States military had its origin in the American Revolution with George Washington and it involved a conflict with one issue, the Army's right to disseminate information for general knowledge and morale. Throughout the war, the British Torries published pamphlets and papers for the purposes of propaganda and misinformation targeted at the Continental Army. Washington realized a need for accurate and timely information and "news" for the troops of the Continental Army. Washington asked the Congress for a printing press, supplies, and personnel to enable his headquarters to provide timely and accurate information and news to the Army. The Congress objected, insisting that providing printed information was education, and that the Army should not be in control of the education of soldiers. The Congress passed the matter to a committee, and this issue was debated throughout the remainder of the war. Washington never received his printing press, but he did, however, persuade some of his wealthy officers to ask their friends to print a journal for the Army. Many tory newspapers and pamphlets being circulated to the public and to the colonial troops full of propaganda and misinformation designed to demoralize and frighten Washington's troops. Washington's aim was to initially counter the disinformation and then build their morale. Washington's officers even provided the paper necessary to print the journals. These journals provided needed information by countering misinformation and doubts, and may have directly affected the morale of the soldiers.

1778 Washington was also credited with an early episode of literacy education encamped at Valley Forge. He directed his chaplain to provide education in the form of reading, writing, and arithmetic instruction for those in his command who desired to improve themselves during their leisure (off-duty) time. The last hospital building was cleared of patients was used as the camp school during the final weeks of the encampment.

1778 Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States by Major Friedreich Von Tories the first attempt by the United States military at standard training and education. Von Tories not only authored the manual, but actually instructed Washington's Army from the manual at Valley Forge.

1781 The United States Marine Corps was established with little change in the training and education (drill, marksmanship, and landing party raid training).

1798 The Marine Corps was a part of the U.S. Navy or U.S. Army, depending on the particular mission at hand. Marines had to be cognizant of Navy Regulations as well as Articles of War.

1808 Marine Corps published an order establishing its first formal training school located at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C.

1813 The Navy schoolmaster program of training and education was established.

1823 The Marine Corps requested that Marines be included into classes dealing with general educational topics that were provided aboard many ships in the Navy schoolmaster program. The request was rejected.

The first formal Army training and education activities, an "Army School of Practice" was established and provided the means to continue training and education in the art of warfare, particularly infantry and calvary.

1824 The School of Artillery was established at Fortress Virginia. This training and education activity was the Army's first formal schooling for enlisted personnel beyond entry-level and on-the-job training.

1826 The School for the Instruction of Infantry, another activity in continuing education, began at Jefferson Barracks near St. Louis.

1833 The first Naval Lyceum was established in New York and organized under the American Lyceum as a literary and scientific association. (Several Naval Lyceums were established at the different Navy Yards as a "means to promote discussion on naval issues.")

1834 An Act for the "better organization of the Marine Corps" officially made the Marine Corps a part of the Navy Department.

1837 The New York Naval Lyceum published the first naval professional journal, The Navy Magazine, from January 1836 until November 1837. The Navy Lyceums survived until the outbreak of the Civil War.

1838 The United States Statute at Large was the only legislation that provided for the education of Army enlisted soldiers in other than military skills. This statute permitted the administrative council at each Army post to hire a chaplin "who would also act as school-master." The statute was interpreted by the post commanders as a "spiritual" educational requirement that was the responsibility of the chaplin to administer. The provision of basic schooling for Army enlisted men was the first Service level general education activity in United States military as stated in the statute. The post commanders were reluctant to become involved in the activities and as a result these were few posts with schools providing basic schooling.

1839 The school for the Marine Corps Band Apprentices (and Marines) established at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. was the first general education effort for the Marine Corps.

1840 Commandant Henderson directed the policy to train all newly-appointed officers at the Headquarters of the Marine Corps in Washington, D.C.

1842 After observing the Navy recruiting young boys into service aboard ships, the Adjutant General of the Marine Corps made the formal request to the Secretary of the Navy that a proportionate number of

recruits be added to the end strength of the Marine Corps so that young boys could also be enlisted. The Secretary of the Navy passed the question to the Attorney General. The request was denied because while the Navy provided training in many maritime skills and education for the young boys recruited the Marine Corps had "no training" suitable for the education of young boys.

1847 The first systematized instructions for recruiting was published, the Regulations for the Recruiting Service of the United States Marine Corps.

1857 Henderson installed instruction in artillery.

1861 The Congress established a standard practice of acquisition of Marine Corps officers who passed a professional examination. The Secretary of the Navy was authorized to draft up and administer the test.

1863 During the Civil War independent agencies attempted to provide education and reading for the Union Army. Reading agents for the Army of the Cumberland provided 35,000 magazines by the end of 1863, and established a "loan library" system with over 250 libraries. By the end of the Civil War, few of the early schools for enlisted men from the 1838 law were still operational.

1866 A major initiative after the Civil War was the creation of the Army Post School System. The War Department, General Order Number 22, permitted the education of "such uneducated soldiers as may be in need of improvement" and the legitimate expenditures of post funds for this purpose. James A. Garfield of Ohio proposed that the requirement of Post Schools be attached to another proposal providing for the detail for ordering of Army officers to college. Garfield was supported by representative Robert C. Schenck, both of whom were Civil War generals. The final proposal was incorporated in the 1866 Army Reorganization Bill and became law. In July 1866 the actual legislation was very explicit with regard to general education: "Schools

shall be established at all post, garrison and permanent camps where troops are stationed, in which the enlisted men may be instructed in common English branches of education and especially in the history of the United States; and Secretary of War may detail such officers and enlisted men as may be necessary to carry out this provision. It shall be the duty of the post or garrison commanders to set apart a suitable room or building for school and religious purpose." (This is a revision of the actual Post and Garrison Statutes from July 28, 1866.) Later in 1866 the War Department authorized construction of chapels and reading rooms to comply with the requirement.

1871 Brigadier General E.O.C. Ord sought to force attention to noncompliance of post schools and requested to establish post schools within his command.

1878 Chaplin George C. Mullins along with General N. H. Davis ensured the requirement for post schools was reiterated in General Order Number 24 of 1878.

1880 A new General order stipulated that enlisted men could be detailed as teachers with additional duty pay of thirty five cents per day. The order further stipulated voluntary attendance for enlisted soldiers and required regular inspections and reports of an officer detailed by the War Department. Officer in Charge of Education in the Army was designated to inspect the post schools within the Army, ensure compliance with General Order 24, and to indicate the War Department was serious about this general education activity.

1882 The Congress required the Marine Corps to obtain some of its officers from the Naval Academy in addition to West Point.

The Marine Corps continued to operate a school for newly commissioned officers now located in Portsmouth, Virginia, made up of a few Naval Academy graduates with graduates of civilian colleges

1885 The Marines Manual was published, the Marine Corps' first handbook on general military subjects, training for enlisted recruits was regulated and standardized.

1891 Commandant Charles G. McGawley endorsed a policy on an examination program for promotion of Marine Corps officers to ensure that they had acquired skills and knowledge required of the rank that they were about to enter.

1899 The Marine Corps' School of Application, which formally trained newly-commissioned officers, began operation again at the Marine Barracks in Annapolis, Maryland.

Marines attended the Naval War College.

1901 The Navy initiated a school of instruction for Petty Officers, primarily for leadership training.

1907 Marines attended the Army's Command and General Staff College.

1907 The School of Application closed again because of Marine Corps deployments to Panama and Cuba.

1908 The School of Application was re-opened in Port Royal, South Carolina, where the name was changed to Marine Officers' School.

1909 Some Marine units established formal programs for non-commissioned officer instruction.

Between 1909 and 1914, the Marine Corps acquired 72 assorted motor vehicles. The Marine Corps was the first Service to adopt motor vehicles for tactical use with the modification of two armored cars. New training in tactics,techniques, and procedures as well as maintenance and operation was required to adapt the new equipment into the operation of the Marine Corps.

1910 The Marine Corps Advance Base School at New London, Connecticut was established.

There was another obscure Marine Corps officer school in Newport, Connecticut in 1910 that provided officers the opportunity to methodically study the problems of its new mission by planning operations involved in securing and defending advanced bases.

The School of Application moved to Norfolk, Virginia. From 1912 to 1919 the school's activity was very limited because many Marine Corps officers were deployed to Nicaragua and Haiti as well as the war in Europe.

1911 Marine Corps' modernization included the adaptation of the airplane.

Marine Corps officers established the Marine Corps Association (MCA).

1912 The Marine Corps Gazette, MCA's periodical, began publication.

1913 Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels issued Secretary of the Navy General Order 53 announcing his program and later General Order 63 that put into effect an educational and vocational training system for the benefit of the enlisted men of the Navy, both ashore and afloat. The "Navy University" was established for all ships and stations providing general education schools. (Unlike the schoolmaster program, Marines now had permission to participate in these educational opportunities.)

The Y.M.C.A. provided representatives at all Marine Corps units.

1918 The AEF planned to open its own "University" for those soldiers that wanted to work on college courses at Nevers, France.

1919 The A.E.F. University was established.

1919 News of this revolutionary experiment was announced in Quantico on November 21, 1919, when The Leatherneck, a single-sheet post newspaper, ran the large-lettered headline. "PLAY OR GO TO SCHOOL EVERY AFTERNOON IS NEW PROGRAM HERE."

1920 Vocational Schools Detachment established at Quantico.

The Marine Corps Schools were established: the Field Officers' School, the Company Grade School, and the Basic School. There was one other formal Marine Corps school located at Norfolk, Virginia, the School for Service Afloat.

M.C.I. established (formerly the Vocational Schools Detachment)

A battalion of Marines from Quantico were dispatched for expeditionary duty to Mexican waters in reaction to a crisis in Mexico. The first test for M.C.I.

M.C.I. moved to Washington, D.C.

1921 M.C.I. took over all extra-military education provided to Marines that was not directly supporting Marine Corps mission oriented training.

1922 M. C. I. reinstituted classroom instruction when the Clerical Schools Detachment was established at Marine Barracks in Washington(1922-1923).

1923 Commandant Lejeune requireD all company grade officers to enroll in the M.C.I. Bookkeeping Course.

1924 Lejeune ordered all officers to enroll in a foreign language course from M.C.I.

1928 M.C.I. established the Warrant Officers Preparatory Course.

M.C.I. established a new department to conduct liaison between M.C.I. and leading commercial and industrial concerns throughout the United States.

1929 The Coast Guard Institute was established with the assistance of M.C.I.

M.C.I. established a complete high school program.

1934 In 1934 the Tentative Manual for Landing Operations was published to provide a doctrinal manual on amphibious operations.

1935 The Manual for Small Wars was published.

1938 The Navy-Marine Corps publication Fleet Tactical Publication replaced Tentative Manual for Landing Operations.

The Manual for the Defense of Advanced Bases was published.

1940 M.C.I. established a contingency plan for its activities to be suspended in the event of war.

1941 On December 8, all operations of M.C.I. were suspended and 68 of the 108 M.C.I. staff were ordered to recruiting duty.

1942 M.C.I. reopened because of its capability to provide education and training to Marines during the war.

The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) was established and was modeled after M.C.I.

M.C.I. began the process of preparing and maintaining their own high school, vocational, technical, and junior college level courses.

1943 The Marine Corps developed course with requirements to complete high school and obtain a diploma.

The Marine Corps accepted the completion of High School General Education Development (GED) tests as the equivalent of a high school education.

1944 The Pacific Branch of M.C.I. was established.

1945 During World War II the peak enrollment of M.C.I. was 71,225 students.

1946 The Pacific branch was disbanded and the personnel transferred to Washington.

M.C.I. established a program of college-level courses.

1948 M.C.I. began the distribution of a handbook containing a listing all courses.

1950 The Congress began appropriating funding for the partial payment of tuition or expenses for off-duty education for all military personnel, thus expanding educational services.

1952 Public Law 416, an amendment to the National Security Act, passed by Congress, guaranteed the continued existence of the Marine Corps, specifying a Marine Corps comprised of the strength not less than three combat divisions and three aircraft wings.

Marine Corps slow-learner and non-English speaking instruction programs were established in the recruit depots and in off-duty programs throughout the Marine Corps.

1953 The concept and mission of M.C.I. was revised with emphasis on professional development of enlisted Marines and a de-emphasis on academic-type courses.

The official title of the Marine Corps Institute Detachment at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. was changed to the Marine Corps Institute.

1955 The control of the tuition aid program funding was decentralized, permitting more liberal disbursements for off-duty education.

1956 M.C.I. was expanded to include development of all courses in all MOS's, both technical and tactical.

1957 Improvements in the off-duty education services finally appeared with the publication of The Off-Duty Education Manual.

The Marine Corps established the College Degree Program to assist career officers in completing college requirements for a baccalaureate degree.

1958 The enlisted basic and advanced general military subjects (GMS) courses were transferred from the Extension School to M.C.I. Also, the Testing and Education unit of Marine Corps Schools consolidated with M.C.I.

The Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program (NESEP) began as an exclusive Navy program to aid in officer accession; however, a Marine Corps Order established a policy that provided an opportunity for outstanding enlisted men to achieve a career as a Marine Corps officer.

1959 All enlisted Marine training courses prepared by the Extension School were transferred to M.C.I. and the Extension School was closed.

1961 The one-millionth student enrolled in M.C.I.

The Off-Duty Education Manual was replaced by The Marine Education Manual.

1963 The Marine Corps began to define and formalize a Special Education Program (SEP) for T/O billets with special education prerequisite. establish procedures for the identification and designation of such billets, and provided guidelines for the processing of applications.

The Advanced Degree Program (ADP) was designed to augment SEP by providing an additional method of graduate study for career officers to qualify them for SEP billets.

1964 The White House Fellows Program was established by the President of the United States.

1968 The Marine Corps established a pilot program to provide a source of career non-commissioned officers (NCOs)who possess a high degree of technical competency in certain designated fields.

1971 The Marine Corps established another degree completion program targeting Staff Non-commissioned Officers (SNCOs).

1973 The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York established the Regents External Degree Program an alternate method of obtaining a college degree.

1973 The Marine Corps established a pilot program for its own enlisted commissioning education program, the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (MECEP).

1974 The Marine Associates Degree Completion Program (MADCOP) was selected as the active Marine Corps education program to be deleted.

1975 The general military subjects the name was changed to Essential Subjects Program and the first Essential Subjects Handbook was published.

1977 The Marine Corps developed an apprenticeship program in conjunction with guidance provided by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor.

1990 In the spirit of the Vocational Schools Detachment of 1920, the Marine Corps created the Front Line Series correspondence courses especially for Marines deployed to Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Shield.

VITA

Wiley N. Boland, Jr. was born on February 14, 1949, in Pontotoc, Mississippi. He received a B.A.E. in social studies and general science from the University of Mississippi, a M.Ed. in Education in curriculum development from the University of West Florida, and a CAGS (certificate of advanced graduate studies) in adult and continuing education from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He completed requirements for an Ed.D. in adult and continuing education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in April 1993.

Mr. Boland was a commissioned officer and designated as a Naval Flight Officer in the United States Marine Corps from 1971 to 1992. While in the Marine Corps, he taught and developed curriculum with the Naval Aviation Training Command. He also developed training in conjunction with the introduction of computer automation in aircraft maintenance and supply accounting. Mr. Boland authored, edited, and developed many Marine Corps, MultiService and Joint Service Doctrine and Tactics, Techniques and Procedure Manuals. He

wrote many articles on these subjects while on active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Boland currently is the Program Director for several computer-based training programs being developed by Continental Dynamics, Inc. for the Department of the Navy, the Federal Aviation Administration, and other federal agencies.

Mr. Boland is married to the former Mary Ann Odom of Jacksonville Beach, Florida and they have three children, Laurie Ann, Kate Marie, and Daniel Christopher.