This article was downloaded by: [University of Calgary]

On: 01 February 2015, At: 08:01

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Royal United Services Institution. Journal

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rusi19>

Public Shool Education as Affecting the Training of Candidates for the Imperial Services

Rev. F. W. Tracy & Major-General H. D. Hutchinson C.S.I.

Published online: 11 Sep 2009.

To cite this article: Rev. F. W. Tracy & Major-General H. D. Hutchinson C.S.I. (1906) Public Shool Education as Affecting the Training of Candidates for the Imperial Services, Royal United Services Institution. Journal, 50:342, 975-999, DOI: [10.1080/03071840609418450](https://doi.org/10.1080/03071840609418450)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03071840609418450>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION AS AFFECTING THE TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR THE IMPERIAL SERVICES.

By the Rev. F. W. TRACY, Head-Master "United Services College."

Thursday, 29th March, 1906.

Major-General H. D. HUTCHINSON, C.S.I. (Director of Staff Duties),
in the Chair.

THE ROYAL NAVY.

THE Senior Service has definitely abandoned all attempt at drawing its material from the public schools. Only in the few cases where Cadets enter Osborne from the Preparatory Department of a Public School have candidates for the Navy any direct touch with Public School life.

How far their early association with public school ideas may have any permanent effect on them is scarcely a matter for practical consideration. One thing only is sure, namely, that the higher the Public School standard, the higher will be that of the Preparatory School.

The new system of combining a good general education with professional training, right on from the age of Public School entry, seems at present to indicate but one serious problem. I refer to the question of obtaining sufficiently high specialised power for individual branches, from an education conducted so far on a common basis. And it may, perhaps, be questioned to what extent the absorbing demand on the directly observant and receptive powers of very young boys may operate against the growth of the reflective and imaginative faculties, without which neither tactics nor strategy can reach their highest development.

But I venture the very strong opinion that not only will a very high average of general quality result, but that development of individual ability will be found in a ratio hitherto unknown to English education.

THE CIVIL SERVICES.

In regard to the Civil Services it only seems necessary to say that whatever in Public School training affects, whether favourably or adversely, the material of the Combatant Services must very largely have

similar effect upon the Civil. An education, for instance, which sends to the Army youngsters possessed of an inveterate habit of industry will operate usefully upon the Civil Service candidate. Civil Service work abroad, indeed, is often of the most intensely trying character, and the utmost that can be done during boyhood towards equipping the Civil Servant for the most arduous tests is a matter of bare justice, not to say Imperial common-sense.

THE ARMY.

What does the Service require?

I will not attempt to deal with the specialised needs of one branch as compared with another, but will only advance some suggestions on what, to a layman, appear to be amongst the chief qualifications to be desired in all officers. Granted that these be not advanced in error, I would urge that definite recognition of them from the earliest educational stage would be good for all citizens, would, by its general influence on Public School life, ultimately improve our Administrative, and would give the best available material from which to draw officers for the Army.

The underlying principles of war may be the same in all ages, but the conditions of modern warfare appear more and more exacting, both of ability and staying power, whilst the consequences of an error appear more likely to be irretrievable. In the circumstances, the question is not: What constitutes a good officer, and how can he be obtained? but: What is the best of the best? and how can the Army be supplied with it?

Active Service in the older days had little of complexity, and often but scanty room for reasoned tactics.

Sheer physical courage, a quick eye for opportunity, and the power of inspiring confidence amongst his men, were, perhaps, some of the chief characteristics of a successful regimental officer.

More than that is needed now. The fiery excitement of combat at close quarters must be the exception, and the strain on all the powers of physical, moral and intellectual endurance, entailed by wide fields of action, long-range weapons, and a foe but seldom visible, must be the rule of any serious campaign.

Modern warfare calls for nerve; for fine temper, great power of endurance, a devotion to duty—not merely earnest, but intelligent—a cultivated observation, and a reasoning power responding in appropriate action to the call of circumstances.

"Men of utility" (I quote the words of a practical educationalist of long experience), "nimble-minded men, men who can grasp principles at a glance, and notice details as second nature, men who have been trained in early life to deduce cause from effect, these are the stamp of men required—the men who can do the right thing at the right moment, who can snatch an opportunity without a second's hesitation." The writer goes on to urge that "there is one lesson which the late Boer War made very apparent, and it is that the ordinary Boer officer was a man better educated for his work than the Britisher. He had been reared in a different school. He may have been inferior in book learning, but the Boer had been trained in Nature's school, where trifles are never overlooked. In observation and deductive reasoning there was no comparison."

To say this is not to blame the individual officer. He was what his training and opportunities made him. It was not his fault that the only school in which he might have learnt—the school of Indian Frontier work—was, in the main, beyond his reach, and that so little of realism, so much of social show attended the life of an average British regiment. What had there been in his boyhood's training to inspire that "curiosity of knowledge" which is the foundation of mental ability, that passion for thoroughness which is content with no half-way houses of attainment?

The Report of the recent Committee on the "Education and Training of Officers of the Army" has resulted in a radical re-adjustment of the antecedent training so far as bookwork is concerned. I believe this re-adjustment makes for good, especially as it calls for some degree of sustained industry from a comparatively early stage.

The selection and treatment of bookwork subjects I purposely avoid discussing. I am anxious to speak of qualities rather than precise learning; of education rather than instruction. It may be said that such qualities and characteristics as have been indicated are largely a matter of temperament. I urge most strongly that the qualities of a man are largely a matter of training, far more largely than is recognised in practice, and that the attainment of a high common standard would bring special aptitudes also to a still higher point.

I venture to regret that the Committee did not deal with this question—and to press its extreme importance.

Quoting from one of the most brilliant of recent utterances on the subject of education ("On Professional Education," by Dr. Clifford Allbutt): "Education, as contrasted with instruction, is a drawing forth of faculties, a quickening, enlarging, and refining of them when brought out, and an establishment of them in habits; so that virtue and reason become easy and pleasant to us. The word is used of mind rather than of morals or of the powers of the body; but by mind we signify both intellect and imagination, and their issue in right action. . . . Education, then, is not the formation of a rigid framework, but of a capacity for ideas and for various and supple adaptations."

The speaker goes on to say: "The problem of education in modern England is that of general schooling, of ascertaining the modes which shall prove most valuable to put each person, during his youth, in touch with the sum of conditions under which he is to lead the best life possible to him; this done, he may the more efficiently be adapted to specific or personal functions. . . . The importance of a universal training of the instrument of mind, before the adaptation of it to special engagements, will be better understood when we realise that truth is neither wholly without us nor wholly within us, but is a function of fact and temperament. Now temperament is partly native, but largely also the creature of habit, and habits—such as the habit of virtue and of comprehensive and precise thinking—are the creatures of education, and especially of education in the plastic years of life.

"Thus the man whose mind has been built up on universal lines, whatsoever his calling, is enabled to free himself from the conventions and temporary notions of the mere 'practical man,' to distinguish the important from the unimportant truths, and to drop swiftly upon

cardinal features—upon the facts which matter.” (“On Professional Education,” Allbutt, pp. 2, 3, 4, 5.)

If the Army is in days to come to be handled by the best of the best, these principles need to be recognised in practical fashion. It is unwise to assume that their recognition in the handling of book-work, even when the utmost is allowed for consequent increase of industry, is any guarantee for the advance of education in the wider sense. Nor does inspection secure any definite advance.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL BOY. HIS STRONG POINTS—HIS DEFECTS.

Yet again to quote Dr. Clifford Allbutt:—

“From our Public Schools our young men derive many fine qualities. As Herodotus says of the Persian youths, they are taught to ride and to speak the truth; and, indeed, when our country loses its manliness and its veracity, it will lose all things. But these fine qualities do not meet the sum of conditions under which the Englishman has to live; he has to do more than to speak and to act with spirit and uprightness, and to read the sporting papers with intelligence. If he is to be equal to the conflict of modern life he must be able to reason, both on man and on nature, to measure his own capacities, to read the hearts and habits of men, and to foresee the trend of natural laws. For these ends, besides energy and will, he must have a curiosity for knowledge, some intellectual seriousness and flexibility, some endurance of attention, some self-possession, and some ideas; qualities eminently in defect in the average products of our Public Schools.”

The best of Public School boys—and they are not few—deserve all that can be said of their essential manliness. I frankly believe them to be the best material in the world. Their defects are, in the main and on the average, the defects of an education lacking in breadth and in practical recognition of certain vital issues.

Public School boys, on the average, acquire neither method nor the habit of strenuous work. There is a great outcry about the cult of athleticism, but there are many, many boys whose athletic training is of the poorest, and this is largely the reason of the excessive glorification of competent athletes. One might say more, but the long and short of it is that many a Public School boy has a great deal of time “cut to waste,” is insufficiently guided to a practical outlook on life, and is, in fact, apt to pass through school with a minimum of the training which he individually needs, and which some happier school fellows receive in good measure.

Learning is to him either a thing abhorrent or of a value strictly commensurate with its negociability in marks. His patriotism is vague. He is ready enough to die for his country, but has little idea of how to live for her. He is crude and undeveloped to a degree, and is honestly unaware of it. His individual needs have not been fairly met. As a man he shows lack of individuality and poverty of resource.

This is no matter of isolated personal opinion. One might quote from multitudinous utterances, both in the daily Press and in more permanent literature.

Recently, for instance, there appeared in the *Lancaster Guardian* a thoughtful comparison between English and American Public Schools. From it, as representative, I take some extracts:—

"There is something lacking, or something in our national life which somehow takes the alertness, enthusiasm, and originality out of a large percentage of the professional and commercial class. Conversely, there is something in American life which stimulates individuality and independence. The stimulating force in American life we take to be the 'Public Schools,' which correspond roughly to our National Schools. The retarding force in England is, in our judgment, the 'Public Schools.'

"To an American the typical Englishman—the man who is caricatured on the stage—is the man who, in England, gains a sort of reflected lustre from his school or college without shedding lustre on either himself. We are all familiar with the type. He walks abroad with the idea that there are two sorts of people in the world—Public Schoolmen and non-Public Schoolmen. . . .

"No one will deny that the products of our Public Schools are gentlemen and athletes—but are nothing else as a rule:—

"Of gods thou shalt have only two:

"Thy goddess 'Form'—Thy god the 'Blue,'

as a witty Oxonian put it, is the creed of four-fifths of the youths who have what is called the Public School spirit.

"Where there should be push and energy there is a well-bred *nil admirari* spirit, servile acquiescence in traditional observance, and total lack of efficiency.

"The average boy leaves school at 18 with an undigested surfeit of Greek and Latin, a superficial knowledge of higher mathematics, combined with utter inaccuracy in simple arithmetic; a smattering of French and German, which is soon forgotten, and a conviction that the only people who ought decently to be expected to know more are 'scholars' and 'freaks.'" ("English *versus* American Public Schools," by F.R.G.S., pp. 4, 6.)

As representative of more serious and permanent literature, here is an extract from "The Upton Letters" (noted in Dr. Clifford Allbutt's book already referred to):—

"I declare that it makes me very sad sometimes to see these well-groomed, well-mannered, rational, manly boys, all taking the same view of things, all doing the same things, smiling politely at the eccentricity of any one who finds matter for serious interest in books, in art, or music; all splendidly reticent about their inner thoughts, with a courteous respect for the formalities of religion and the formalities of work; perfectly correct, perfectly complaisant, with no irregularities or angular preferences of their own, with no admiration for anything but athletic successes, and no contempt for anything except originality of ideas. They are so nice, so gentlemanly, so easy to get on with, and yet, in another region, they are so dull, so unimaginative, so narrow-minded. They cannot, of course, be all intellectual or cultivated, but they might be more tolerant, more just, more wise. They ought to be able to admire vigour and enthusiasm in every department, instead of in one or two, and it is we who ought to make them feel so, and we have already too much to do." ("The Upton Letters," p. 48.)

But enough of fault finding. Let me venture some attempt at constructive criticism.

SUGGESTIONS.

Mental, Moral, and Physical Training.

It would be ridiculous to discuss these components of education as though they were divided "into water-tight compartments." I venture some rough suggestions without attempting separate classification.

Every boy ought to work, and can be trained to work, habitually, methodically, and with a fair average of self-exertion.

Business-like organisation of a school can be carried to such a point that every boy does at least a fair amount of work in all his subjects, that his weak points make themselves definitely obvious both to himself and to his masters, and that he realises, in some degree, the effect of his individual efficiency or inefficiency on the school at large. The relation of staff to boys should be so planned that every boy is a member of a sufficiently small unit of control, not based upon age or intellectual standard, under the care of a sufficiency of well-chosen masters. Every boy should receive regular physical training, and have regular athletic exercises, and every boy, according to his age and growth, should be a member of Cadet Corps, or of a junior squad exercised in simple drill, miniature rifle shooting and signalling. There should indeed be continuity of training, from first entry at the Preparatory School to the latest day of Public School life.

Every boy should have a fair modicum of manual training, and, with some range of choice, should be expected to maintain some special "hobby," practical or otherwise. Accuracy, readiness, thoroughness, and originality would thus be encouraged.

In 1903, on the initiative and at the charges of a private citizen, Mr. Alfred Mosely, there went to America a Commission of experts to investigate the conditions of American Secondary Education. The resultant report is a most valuable document, much of which will well repay perusal in view of the general question now before us. The evidence of the value of manual training as an educational force is overwhelming. Space forbids the use of more than two typical extracts, the first from the report of the Headmaster of Bradfield College; the second from that of the Vice-Chairman of the Rochdale Education Committee.

Says Dr. Gray:—

"Manual Training. Any survey of American secondary education would be incomplete without a reference to the manual training, which forms an integral part of the systems in the majority of Secondary Schools in the United States. The connection between mind and hand is recognised there to an extent which preconceived prejudices have hitherto rendered impossible in England. But instead of manual training being confined to those who are to pursue an industrial or engineering career, or to those who are relegated to 'shops' merely as a *dernière ressource*, because they are incapable of the abstractions of book learning, in the United States it is regarded in many of the best developed schools as an integral part of a liberal education. Its importance in this aspect varies indeed in different States and in different cities, but everywhere it occupies an honourable place. It is, moreover, graded on carefully-thought out systems, from the cardboard 'modelling' of the kindergarten, to the skilled

engineering processes in the colleges and universities. Though space forbids me to enlarge on the value of this feature of American education, my report would lack a completeness, satisfactory to myself, if I did not pause to emphasise my profound sense of the value of manual training as scientifically carried out in the schools of the United States, leading as it does to the happiest results in promoting that versatility and alertness which is so characteristic of American workers. It is almost impossible to exaggerate it." ("Report of the Mosely Educational Commission to the United States of America," pp. 169, 170.)

Mr. Alderman Heape discusses the subject specially and at length. The following remarks bear directly upon the particular point I am urging:—

"In the United States there is a very remarkable feature in connection with manual training which is unique, and obtains in no other country, and that is, the manual training high schools. In these institutions, in connection with a high school education, a large amount of time is given to handwork of a most elaborate nature."

"The principals are most emphatic in expressing their belief in the educational value of the work, stating that the boys learn such subjects as geometry and algebra much better from realising their value and importance, and that in general they easily 'forge ahead' of other boys.

"The boys are all most keen at their work, and it is constantly urged that if you in the workshops secure keenness and persistence of method, these qualities do not stop in the shop, but are carried into all the other work of the school. The educative value of the manual work in itself is valued very highly; it means care, forethought, reason, judgment, patience, exactness." (Report of Mosely Commission, pp. 207, 208.)

For an exhaustive account of the whole system of manual training, the Report of Professor Reichel should be read. (Report of Mosely Commission, pp. 274-309.)

Now to obtain this value of manual and practical training, such training must be universal, and, in fact, compulsory, over a considerable portion, if not the whole, of school life. It means a busy school, and organisation pushed to a high degree.

A great deal of cant is current about compulsion. Universal compulsion, in a school, within very brief space becomes universal and traditional habit. After all, a school is, in the main, what the Headmaster makes it, just as I am led to understand a regiment is what the Colonel makes it. And what would be priggishness in the individual can be tone in the many.

It is easy to utter cheap jibes at a machine-made education. Of course, a really busy schooling demands not only care, but firmly maintained organisation; but I am much mistaken if it will not result both in high average attainment and in the encouragement of individuality.

Immorality among boys needs more unflinching recognition, more drastic handling, and more comprehensive measures of safeguard. The subject is one which it is painful to discuss; but it is of an urgency which it is both fatuous and insincere to shirk.

On the moral question, then, parents should require of masters, and masters should encourage parents, to be vigilant, sympathetic, and straightspoken. It is far too little recognised at how early an age a boy may go wrong, what insidious temptations he has to face, how often he falls through sheer ignorance, and how responsive he is to those who deal with him sympathetically, but straight to the point. Every individual boy needs definite guidance in this matter, and ought to have it, and every parent should require assurance of the master's attitude therein. Cubicles should be discouraged, and the open dormitory system should be the rule. Both for this and for other reasons the general laws of health should be taught, not as abstract propositions, but as directly affecting the efficiency of the individual. From the merely utilitarian point of view, the boy of vicious habit is and ever must be damaged material.

The real but vague patriotism of the average boy could and should be made the basis of clear teaching on the calls and the privileges of citizenship, and the stimulus of conscious effort towards progress of all sorts.

Cadet Schools.

I must confess to an apprehension that Cadet Schools for the antecedent training of all candidates for the Army may prove needful.

It would, I think, be highly injurious to some of the best interests of the country if all candidates for the Army had to pass through Cadet Schools. It would end once for all some of the most inspiring traditions of many a Public School, for it would indeed destroy the direct personal application of that object lesson in patriotism which every boy can appreciate in heart, however crude may be his mental appreciation of civic duty and privilege. It would narrow the outlook of officers of the Army, and make the public still more oblivious than it already is of the fact that officers are fellow citizens and men of like feelings and needs with the civilian.

The circumstances of the Navy—the need of a common standard of thorough familiarity with peculiar surroundings, the highly specialised demands of the profession, the continual re-assorting of the members of a staff—call for an education conducted in common from the earliest possible age; and the comparatively small number of officers required makes this feasible.

No such identity of training could, I think, be secured, even were it desirable, in the case of the Army. The numbers involved are too large. A school or schools of 1,600 to 1,800 cadets would be necessary in order to supply with certainty the normal annual demand for, say, 350 officers. All flexibility of supply would be eliminated, and in time of sudden increased demand, very crude material would have to be requisitioned. The need of a large and flexible supply of good material is, indeed, both an argument for some use of the Cadet School, and a reason against its complete adoption as the one system.

I believe one Cadet School to be an actual necessity. Without a common standard of reference and example, to which schools and parents alike can refer with confidence, it will be long before the keenest of Public School masters can bring Public School training to anything approaching a common standard of efficiency.

A Cadet School of 500 boys would be invaluable in this respect. It would also produce an output of the highest and most direct value

to the Service, by reason both of the quality of its men and the general influence of their efficiency. It should be a Model Public School, with a military bias, not a specialised and professional Military School. Its discipline should be scholastic, not military, exercised upon units of organisation established on military outlines. Its literary education should be on broad and consistent modern lines, and not limited to mere examination requirements. It should give well-balanced manual, physical and military training. Its direct authority and detailed administration should be in the hands of professional schoolmasters, working under a Board appointed by the Army Council, just as a Public School is worked under its Governors. Entry to it should be at the age of 13. A candidate provisionally accepted, after full private report, should first go before a Medical Board, with liberty of reference to a Board of Appeal, and, being certified as of sound physique, be classified according to his physical quality. He should then be admitted to a simple qualifying examination much on the lines of the present Osborne Examination. What was left of him should then go before a Board of Selection, before whom should be laid a brief of the information derived from private report, medical inspection, and literary examination. The candidate should appear under a distinguishing number only, and due safeguard should be used against any imputation of private influence.

Cadets thus selected should form exceptionally good material. During their course they should be open to withdrawal if found in any way unsuitable.

They should be required to pass a standard examination, equivalent to the Qualifying Examination, before becoming eligible for admission to Sandhurst or Woolwich. After this examination they should work on for the open competition, just like other Public School boys, with the exception that, taking the annual output at, say, 100 to 125, there should be offered for competition in the school annually say, 30 or 40 special cadetships, carrying admission to the R.M.A. and R.M.C. respectively.

The effect on Public School work generally would, I submit, be very great. Parenthetically, I would suggest that, whether in connection with such a scheme or not, the Army Council might greatly promote both the efficiency of Cadet Corps and the solution of the problem of universal military and physical training in Public Schools, if they would institute a figure of merit to be awarded on the aggregate efficiency of a Cadet Corps, and assign corresponding "Service marks" of moderate amount to candidates therefrom.

Local circumstances of Cadet Corps differ widely, but, provided efficiency marks could be obtained by optionally selected tests out of a comprehensive schedule, each corps could adapt itself to its circumstances. In a Cadet School or in Cadet Corps above a certain number such a figure of merit might be separately obtainable by each company or half company, and would greatly stimulate smartness. This, however, by the way.

The organisation of a Cadet School need present little difficulty either in relation to instruction or domestic care. It should be divided into, say, six equal senior houses or company units, with two junior companies, through which cadets would pass before being assigned to a senior company. Each unit should have its distinct disciplinary staffing and house quarters, but there should be central messing and instructional arrangements.

There would be no difficulty about staffing. Among the Army crammers alone there is a sufficiency of brilliant and stimulating teachers intimately acquainted with the needs of the Service and the defects of the present-day candidate, and eminently capable of forming the backbone of a sound staff of instructors and lecturers.

Neither does finance present any obstacle. One architect at least has solved the problem of planning a school for practical and economical working, and buildings for such a school as I have sketched can be erected at a cost not exceeding £250,000, and for a much lower sum if a wise-use is made of modern constructive methods. The actual working cost need not exceed £80 per head per annum, and an inclusive standard payment of £130 per annum by civilians would allow of Service claims being recognised at a standard rate of £100 per annum, and special reductions being made in special cases. It would also allow of a sufficient sinking fund. The cost to the State would thus be nil; there would be no danger of the creation of a military caste—not that there is much danger of militarism in any shape or form in this country—and both military and civil interests would profit.

Such a school would, I believe, be the ideal Public School, and would aid a re-organisation of our great schools generally, whereby their fine traditions and distinctive spirit could have full play amidst more practical conditions.

Failing some such movement, I fear there is no alternative but a system of strictly professional Cadet Schools.

The demands of the age are too urgent for our slow rate of progress, too exacting for our unbusiness-like and wasteful methods.

Commander the Lord ELLENBOROUGH, R.N. (Retired):—I regret that I may have to leave this theatre before hearing all the criticisms of those who may differ from me. I hope that my doing so will not be taken as a discourtesy on my part. I cannot be in two places at once. The House of Lords is about to place on record its high appreciation of the services of Lord Milner, in South Africa, and I feel that Lord Milner's services have a prior claim on me. I quite agree with the lecturer when he states that our public schools are in great need of reorganisation and reform, and that the War Office ought to establish an Army Cadet School, on the lines of Osborne and Dartmouth. If found successful, more schools of the same pattern should be established. Eventually, I think that educated men would prefer that their sons should go to such schools, even if not intended for the Army, instead of being sent to dead language schools, where an Elizabethan education is given in a post-Victorian age, and where boys are really being specialised for the Church and the Bar. The present position of the education of the sons of gentlemen cannot be thoroughly understood without reviewing the origin of the older public schools and of the Universities. They were originally founded, when Latin was almost the only language in which books were written, when there was no English literature worth mentioning, and when the only educated professions were the Church and the Law. Latin was also the language of diplomacy. At that time most of the lawyers belonged to the Church. In fact, all who were able to read or write, claimed "benefit of clergy!" More schools were founded in the time of Edward VI., and Greek was introduced into England in 1490. Many teachers of dead languages appear to think that what was good enough in the time of Edward VI. is good enough for boys in the time of

Edward VII. As if the world had stood still in the interval. The time of Edward VI. was a pre-Shakespearian age, when English literature can scarcely be considered to have existed. Men who knew a little about science were considered alchemists, or magicians, and ran a considerable risk of being burnt alive by the Church under the Education Acts of those days. I believe that there are some men now who would burn a science master if they could do so with impunity. The stagnation of our public schools can also be partly accounted for by the mischievous practice of masters, who, in their own interests, are always telling boys, "That's right my boy, always stick up for your school," until the poor fellow thinks it mean and ungentlemanly to say a word against his school, either while there, or in after life. Now, if such boys, on attaining manhood, had endeavoured to reform our schools, they would have been doing a great service to their successors at those institutions. For instance, look at the barbarous pronunciation of the languages of Cicero and Demosthenes as taught at the Universities and at public schools. Look at the unnecessary difficulties placed in the way of the student by the manner in which those languages are taught. The Universities might remedy these by decreeing that after a certain appointed day no man should be allowed to teach Greek at a University, who had not studied modern Greek for at least six months in Greece itself, or to teach Latin unless he was well acquainted with the Italian language, and was also able to converse in Latin. In fact, all our teachers of Latin and Greek should be sent to school again during the holidays. Graduates from Athenian and Italian Universities should be imported for the purpose of teaching during the interval. I myself began Latin at the age of six, Greek at the age of 9, and wasted a great deal of my time in the study of those languages until I was 13. At the age of 11, in company with other lads of the same age, I actually wrote Latin verses, with the help of a verse-making machine that the masters called a *Gradus*. I looked out a Latin word, found a synonym that would scan, and put it in regardless of its suitability. I had to read a great deal of Ovid, and always wished that I could have heard the opinion of Ovid on my verses, instead of that of the masters who sometimes praised them. I think that my poetry would have amused Ovid. It must have been something like Baboo English. Dead languages are the barnacles of modern education. Even in science, we constantly handicap ourselves by using Latin and Greek words, when English would answer the purpose a great deal better. I suppose this is done as a concession to the classical side, and to the mediæval system of making a mystery of knowledge. When the Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children comes up for revision, I hope that clauses will be added to it, making the taking of money for teaching Latin to children under nine, and Greek to children under 12, offences punishable by a month's imprisonment without the option of a fine. Boys should certainly read translations of the classics. I prefer Lord Derby's Homer, but Pope's version will appeal to many. The study of the original should be deferred until the brain has reached maturity. I first heard of science from Faraday, when I attended his lectures for boys during my Christmas holidays. Faraday thoroughly understood boys. They liked him, and enjoyed his teaching. I have often thought what a much higher position England would now hold in the scales of civilisation when compared with other nations, if the members of a governing body of a school like Eton or Harrow had offered him a Headmastership, and had given him a free hand. He always refused to enter the service of wealthy manufacturers, preferring to

continue his work of research on a small income. But I think that the position of Headmaster of a great public school would have tempted him, as he might have felt that in such a position he could have been more useful to the world in general. For nearly fifty years, the entrance to the Army and the Civil Service has been through the gate of competitive examination, on the Chinese system of a pen, ink, and paper knowledge of ancient literature. Has the Chinese Army been so successful in war as to be deserving of imitation? Is their Civil Service system much better than ours? We have committed this folly in deference to the wishes of a small group of persons who are pecuniarily interested in the teaching of dead languages in the obsolete manner that I have referred to. None of these men have ever seen service, yet we have allowed them to dictate to the nation what is necessary for young officers to know on joining the Army. The older public schools having become obsolete as wooden battle-ships; their place has been partly taken by technical schools, who, although they may give a good training in certain branches of science, too often neglect to teach ancient and modern history, English literature, English and other modern languages. Public schools and technical schools have much to learn from one another. The modern side at a public school is generally a half and half affair, looked down upon by the dead language masters. Public schools only educate one-half of a boy and technical schools the other half. A boy is taught how to use a pen, and to catch a cricket ball, but otherwise his manual training is completely neglected. For these reasons it was found necessary to establish a school for Naval Cadets at Osborne. I hope Mr. Haldane will have the courage to shake off the yoke of the public schools, and to establish similar institutions for the Army, leaving the older establishments to supply the wants of boys intended for the Church or the Bar.¹

¹As, by the rules of the Institution, I was only allowed a ten minutes' speech, I have thought it desirable to add this note to what I said, so to prevent my views being misunderstood, I hold that all boys should be taught history, both ancient and modern. They should not, however, begin with Julius Cæsar's invasion of Great Britain, and then never get to the end of the book, or be taught all about Themistocles and Salamis, to the exclusion of Nelson and Trafalgar, Togo and Tsushima. They should also learn the English language thoroughly, read some of its best literature, and practice composition, but should not be made to work at grammar by itself too early in life. They ought to receive instruction in French, German, arithmetic, mensuration, drawing to scale, geography, and the simpler elements of geology, physics, electricity, mechanics, and hydrostatics, hygiene, including personal hygiene. They should also practise gymnastics, and some form of manual training. Now there is not time enough for all these subjects unless Greek and Latin are given up. Euclid should not be taught, but a copy should be kept in the school library for reference. Considering the inferiority of their instruments, it is a wonder how much he and his predecessors discovered. He never had a pair of parallel rulers, nor any of those delicate instruments of measurement that we now possess. As, however, he knew nothing of Algebra, decimals, or logarithms, no school in England would at present think of engaging him as an assistant, until he had spent some time in modern studies. All boys, unless exempted by a medical certificate, should join the cadet corps at about 13. Boys might commence specialising at the age of 15 when those intended for the Church and the Bar might commence Latin and Greek,

Major-General Sir THOMAS FRASER, K.C.B., C.M.G., R.E. :—This is a subject in which every soldier ought to be interested. First of all, there are two remarks which have been made in this instructive lecture, on which I would like to say a word. The lecturer remarks that the Boers were better trained for the late war than the British officer. I think he should recollect this, that there are two races in the world, the Japanese and the Boers, who, while they have had many of the advantages of civilisation, and access to the best arms in the world, have not been corrupted by civilisation as the most of Europe and a great part of America have been. When I say corrupted I mean that civilisation has, more or less, destroyed the fitness for war in the men of all the highly civilised races. It was so in the days of the Romans; it is so now. Civilised races only hold their own by more highly trained brain power, by higher education; by constantly adopting scientific improvements; and by the perfection of the armaments they turn out. They are not, however, as well fitted for the hardships of war and the strain of fighting as the less nervous races, which live a simpler, a more open-air, and a less artificial life. We see the perfection of soldierly qualities in the Japanese, who, with great brain power, instructed by the highest intellects of Europe, have combined with that the physical fitness and endurance of their men, which has enabled them to fight so splendidly. On the other hand, the Boers did lack one great thing, which is the mainstay of every Army, and which ours possessed, that is discipline. Discipline is the spirit that enables men, when ordered, to die willingly, straightforwardly, and without hesitation; and that is a thing the Boers hardly possessed. They were never willing to die at all. Some behaved gallantly on occasions, but I think I do them no injustice if I say they were incapable of any general offensive policy. In that way they were not to be compared with the officers of our Army, nor of the great Armies of Europe. With regard to America, I see the lecturer, in quoting another experienced authority, says that the pupils in the United States are much more learned, much more brilliant, and more active than ours, and that that is due to the public schools. I think, as far as it is true, it is due to an entirely different cause. The United States possesses an area not much smaller than Europe, without Russia, and a white population of 65 millions. Consequently, there is in that country an immense

which should be taught as living languages, and pronounced as the Italians and modern Greeks pronounce it. Of course, schoolmasters will have to learn to speak Latin and Greek. Some of them may complain of having to go to School again, but those who are too old to learn are too old to teach. In an article on the awakening of China, in the *Morning Post*, of the 4th of April, I find :—"Even the old scholars, the 'literati,' the strongest conservative force in China, have caught the infection, and students of thirty or forty years of age are found patiently starting their education again." Our schoolmasters must do the same. We copied the Chinese in establishing an examination in ancient literature, as a condition of admission to the public services, and now we had better follow their example in giving it up. The education of future generations of boys and men must not be sacrificed to the vested interests of a small knot of men who can find no use for their Greek except that of imparting it to others. The recent action of the teachers of ancient Greek, who flocked to Cambridge for the purpose of outvoting the more enlightened residents on the question of compulsory Greek, was a disgrace to English education, and calls for immediate legislative interference.

opportunity and scope for energy. The whole country is filled with the idea of work and of doing work, because they have the space before them, and they have the encouragement that a young race has to do great things, as they have already done. I do not really believe that we should be right in saying that it is the difference in education. I can only say my conviction, based on wide observation in the States, is, that, as in every other country, success in life is due to force of character and capacity for giving effect to it. Education to a certain extent fits men for using the great qualities that are born in some, and that are developed by the circumstances in which they live. With regard to the subject that the lecturer has put forward as the basis of his lecture, the Cadet School. In this connection the Army is now told that because the Navy has adopted a new system of particularist education, that the Army should adopt it also. The Navy doubtless knows its own requirements, and how to meet them; so does the Army; but, as the conditions are absolutely different, the presumption is that what suits the Navy is the last thing that would suit the Army, and I must say, as an officer who has seen something of military education, that I look with very grave doubt and anxiety on the idea of establishing anything of the kind. I am entirely convinced that we cannot do better than adhere to that system of public competition in the justice of which the country has well-founded confidence, and which enables us to draw officers from the public schools of the country, as far as they can supply us. We must remember that Army candidates form only a small part of the output of the public schools. The time is, however, coming presently when the number of Army officers required will be so great that we cannot count on getting them all from the public schools; but as far as we can, my view is, that we ought, in the interest of the country, to strive for more effective education in the public schools, and draw as before many of our officers from them. We have tried the experiment of Cadet Schools; we have had cadets who came from the schools, and I can only say that the opinion that was formed in the Army at the time was entirely unfavourable to the system, which was abandoned, and I sincerely hope that it may never be re-adopted. But I will say this, that it is extremely important, if we are to rely on the public schools, that they should conform to commonsense measures of practical efficiency. My friend, Lord Ellenborough, has said what was very much in my own mind with regard to the present education in the public schools. The educational output is inferior. It is not entirely the fault of the public schools, where it is well known they overwork boys physically to keep them out of mischief; but public opinion goes further, and insists that all else must give way to the cult of sport; and that literary work is quite unimportant. This leaves too little time for tired boys to do real work, and, coupled with the attempt to teach too many things, leads to most of them learning nothing well. A Cadet School would be no cure for this. I quite agree with Lord Ellenborough that the exclusive training in classics, which was part of my own education, does not meet modern requirements. I do not believe that any boys can learn thoroughly well at school more than two languages, of which at least one should be modern, and a little mathematics; a great many can only learn one language. We must remember that languages and mathematics cost so much drudgery and time, it is only under school discipline they are learnt by most. They are also the only subjects which can be tested by examinations, for they cannot be crammed. I know there is a very strong feeling among teachers that they should be the only judges of the results of their

teaching, and that independent examinations are a mistake. All I can say with regard to that is, that independent examinations are the only methods by which the individual finds out whether he knows anything at all. Such examinations set up a standard of education for schools to work up to; and, without them, the State cannot be sure, when it takes boys into its service, that they are competent from their education to give effect to the capacities which it is hoped they have. I trust that the Army will continue to rely on the public schools; but undoubtedly the public schools, and the Universities which rule them, must reform themselves, not only in the interests of the Army, but in the much greater interests of the whole community. Then we shall not want Cadet Schools with their many disadvantages and particularisms, which tend to create an Army cast. The Navy, where boys are rightly entered very young, has presumably no alternative; the Army fortunately has, and should stick to it.

The Rev. A. E. RUMB, D.D. (Headmaster Eltham College):—I belong to that class which has been so completely pulverised already by Lord Ellenborough's eloquence. I am one of those benighted teachers of classics, but in spite of the pulverisation, I have still courage to rise upon my legs simply because I do not see any other schoolmaster present. Although I am sorry to have to do so to a brother headmaster, it seems to me, if I may say so, that I ought to rub in what has been already said by the last speaker. It is not as though the public schools were not progressive. Despite his lordship's eloquence, I think there is a difference between the education in the time of Edward VI. and in the time of Edward VII. Even, amidst hide-bound tradition, which nobody regrets more than schoolmasters, there is a certain amount of progress being made. We have got out of the trammels of exclusively Latin and Greek. We have got to know that there is such a thing as mathematics; we have got to know that there is such a thing as science; and we have got to know perfectly well the value of manual training, and also of physical training. These things are established facts in most public schools. The problem, of course, is to adjust the various branches of education; and I venture to differ entirely from the lecturer on the following grounds. It does seem to me very strongly in the light of experience (and anyone will readily recall many schools to their mind) that a class school is necessarily narrow. Now, what I am sure every officer here present would wish is, that the future officers should have greater breadth of view. It has been conclusively proved in the case of Marlborough, in the case of Wellington, in the case of Epsom, and in the case of many other schools which were originally founded as class schools, that a class school is an absolute mistake, because it gets necessarily only that class of scholars which belong to its particular class, and its pupils do not obtain the benefits which come from mixing with boys of other views, boys whose objects in life will be entirely different. Therefore, I am sorry to have to differ with my brother headmaster, but I do so entirely, absolutely and completely. I think by those means you would get not a progressive type of Army officer, which is what we want, but you would necessarily get a "class" officer coming from such a school. You will correct me if I am wrong, but I think history shows that when Wellington was founded the first headmaster, if I may use school-boy language, had a tremendous row with his governing body, because they wanted it a class school confined to the Army, and he said: "No, that will necessarily give it a narrow tone." He won his point, I believe,

with considerable exertion, with the result that Wellington was freer, and all the other schools freer, just because they are not class schools. I hesitate to speak from personal experience, but I belong to what was once a class school; but I am perfectly certain it derives very great benefit from the fact that it is no longer so. If, therefore, the public schools will reform themselves—and they are reforming themselves—I cannot help personally thinking that the best material for the Army will be drawn from them. Although I may perhaps be taking up too much time, may I throw out, for the reflection of the Army officers present, whether it is not advisable to do away with the class institutions at Sandhurst and at Woolwich. Some of us who have been thinking very deeply on this problem have come to the conclusion that there is attached to them a “class” feeling which ought not to be attached to them; and some of us have come to the conclusion that if the old Universities will progress—and they are progressing—they will give an education to the Army officer which no class institution can possibly give. If any Army officer will carefully study the syllabus of Army studies, which has been drawn up by the University of Oxford for this year, it would surprise him to see what a tremendous lot the University is trying to do with a view to getting Army men to go there. I speak altogether under correction, but I do not think experience has proved that the men who come from the University are by any means a failure; on the contrary, I have heard many people say that they are better than those who are trained in class institutions. The Universities, of course, would have to widen out, but they are widening out every day; everybody who looks at the course of studies in the University of Oxford for this year will see that that is so. That is only by the way; but I must confess I do not agree in the least with the lecturer in his main contentions. I ought, if I may say so in passing, to throw out a word of thanks to him for the many excellent things which he has brought before us—the need, for example, of physical training for all; the need also of manual training for all; and many other points in his lecture with which one can unhesitatingly agree.

T. MILLER-MAGUIRE, M.A., LL.D. (Barrister-at-Law, Inner Temple):—I would like to begin by congratulating Mr. Tracy for bringing before such a distinguished and highly interested audience, a subject on which the future of our Navy and Army, too, indeed, of every member of our Empire depends. Naval and military efficiency depend—may I quote Latin ideas, if not words, by permission of Lord Ellenborough—on sound brains in sound bodies. In modern times, and having regard to the rivalry of highly trained and intellectual races in the Far East, and in the Far West, as well as in Europe, brain power, as the lecturer pointed out, is to physical power as ten to one, and in all ages, the moral has been to the physical as three to one. Mr. Tracy very properly holds up the fashionable public schools to contempt. Lord Ellenborough believes that even their very classical education, so-called, is a fatuous anachronism. I quite agree that these schools are plague spots; they are centres of intellectual and moral decay. Of course, they might be centres of light and leading. But is there any evidence that the majority of their pupils—and such splendid material too!—after all the waste of their time and their parents' money, are fit to lead their poorer fellow-countrymen in the paths of patriotism, or self-denial, or duty-culture? Quite the opposite! The richer classes are only too often a disgrace to our civilisation. Ask the Navy League, the Army League, and the National Service Leagues what they think of the moral and

mental tone of the public school products. Ask the Labour Members of Parliament what they think of Oxford and Eton M.P.'s. Now, we contend that, notwithstanding Lord Ellenborough's censures, a true study of the spirit of the ancients—"the wisdom of the ancients"—would be very valuable. I would tolerate much devotion to Thucydides, Euripides, Homer, Virgil, and Tacitus. If the clerical school-master imbued his students with the contempt for mere games and luxury, and the patriotism and brain and nerve power that animated the heroes of Plutarch; if the tone of these modern Christians were half as good as the tone of Chaucer's Knight, or even as that of Japanese Bushido, we could forgive much. Classical education, as England has, as his Lordship contends, became classical tomfoolery. I had read more classical works in translations, and in the original at the age of 16 than nine-tenths of the Eton boys read in all their lives, and these works did as much good, especially as we were impregnated with ancient history, including the warnings of Gibbon. I see Lord Ellenborough agrees, I salute him and greet him, and rejoice in his honest utterances. Let him go back to the Parliament and teach the paltry political imposters of both parties, Chapman's "Homer," Dryden's "Virgil," Bacon's Essays, and Gibbon, and he will do the State much service. But the miserable clerical pedants, whom he has ridiculed, do not teach English literature, or the history of our Empire, or the lessons of Roman or Greek literature and history, they only teach very bad syntax and prosody at enormous cost. Enthusiasm does not exist in their dreary caravanserais. I felt all aglow, almost intoxicated with rapture, as I read Homer, and Virgil, and Cicero, and Chaucer, and Milton, and Spenser, and Burke, in my youthful years—I almost feel so still. These mighty writers chronicling the deeds of heroes, and painting the charms of Nature, and the graces of Eve or Venus, set my young soul on fire. I know not, with what weird excitement; but

"Valley, grove, and stream,
The earth and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled with celestial light,
The glory and the brightness of a dream."

Listening to his Lordship, all these early visions thronged back to my memory. I felt once again under the spell of Prospero, and my memory began to "Clothe the palpable and the familiar with golden exhibitions of the dawn." It so happens that I have a strange document in my pocket that so ably supports Lord Ellenborough that I quote it, as against the contemptible anachronism which he justly attacks; but will he admit that any good comes from classics?

Lord ELLENBOROUGH :—I admit that history is a very good thing.

Dr. MAGUIRE :—Then you agree with Euripides and Tacitus that games and sports and gambling are signs of natural degeneracy, and that we must degenerate unless we turn from play to knowledge? The German Emperor anticipated Lord Ellenborough, and turned Eton and Harrow systems into public contempt twenty years ago, as follows :—"Geehrter Herr Amtsrichter,—Accept my heartiest thanks for the two pamphlets which you sent to me. I have read 'What we are Suffering From' with great interest and still greater pleasure. At last, then, someone has stepped forth to attack with energy this petrified and most soul-killing

of all systems. I subscribe to every word you have written. Fortunately, I had two and a half years in which to convince myself of the manner in which our youth are sinned against. On many things which you adduce I have myself pondered in silence. Homer, the glorious man, for whom I greatly 'enthused,' Horace, Demosthenes, whose orations must inspire everyone—in what manner were they read? With any enthusiasm for the descriptions of the battle, the arms, or of nature? Heaven forbid! Every sentence was divided and quartered with the dissecting knife of the grammatical, fanatical philologists, until the skeleton was smugly laid bare and the general admiration claimed for the number of manners in which *an* or *epi* could be placed. THE LATIN AND GREEK ESSAYS (A MONSTROUS NONSENSE), what an amount of time and trouble they swallowed! and what stuff it was that finally was produced. Horace would have given up the ghost at sight of it! Away with this rubbish! War to the knife against such teaching! The result of this system is that our schoolboys are better versed in the syntax and grammar of the ancient tongues than the old 'Greeks' themselves, that they know by heart the generals, battles, and order of battle in the Punic and Mithridatic wars, but are very much in the dark concerning the battles of the Seven Years' War, to say nothing of the 'far too modern' wars of '66 and '70, which they have not 'yet had'!!! Why not teach English literature and British history to our 40,000,000 of people, who, from these Isles, are responsible for 34,000,000? Why ignore Shakespeare, and Pope, Dryden, and Bacon, and Byron, who teaches us more about the ancients in the "Essays," and in Childe Harold, than is taught in the class-rooms of Balliol or Winchester?

LORD ELLENBOROUGH :—I do not want to leave them out. I am arguing in favour of them.

DR. MAGUIRE :—Well, so be it! But the gallant officer in the chair will be surprised when I tell him that twenty years ago there was a course which English officers learned, which was an admirable course—it embodies the very ideas of the noble Lord. It contained the history of France; it contained the Peninsular War; it contained the Seven Years' War; it contained the old Hundred Years' War between France and England—before there was an *entente cordiale*; and it contained Shakespeare, Chaucer, Pope, Spenser, and Byron, and Burke. It contained all these excellent branches of study, and officers of the Army, who are now a credit to their race, admit that the best minds of the British Army were impregnated with literature twenty or thirty years ago under that system. It was spoiled because the Stanleys, Stanhopes, and Morleys, and other political experimentalists at the War Office listened to the public school-masters, and deliberately degraded education in the interests of these triflers. How do I know that? Lord Morley, when I challenged him, wrote and told why. He said that he wanted to please Eton and Harrow, and similar anachronisms. I appeal to this audience to use its influence, that, for the future, the officers and gentlemen of England may, as the German Emperor insists in the case of his people, be thoroughly well grounded in the language and traditions of their own race, not that I would have them leave out the excellent traditions of any other race, or the warnings of any other race. I would like to emphasise the point about the decay of the nation in the loftiest subjects not being ignored. But Lord Hugh Cecil has distinctly stated that the religious teaching of the public schools

results in the development of religious ignorance and indifference among the members of the upper and middle classes of England, that was not to be found among the poorer classes of his own constituents. But I will not wander into the paths of theology, and I will conclude by saying that I am in hearty sympathy with Lord Ellenborough, and desire to offer my thanks to Mr. Tracy for a lecture which has already led to much good and to an enthusiastic debate.

Lieut.-Colonel T. H. BAYLIS, K.C., M.A. (late 18th Middlesex V.R.C.) :—I accept the challenge of Lord Ellenborough. I am an old public school boy.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH :—So am I.

Lieut.-Colonel BAYLIS :—I am glad to hear it. It is eighty years ago since I went to Harrow School. I remained there eight years, so I think I know something of the old public schools, and I also know something about the new public schools. The new public school is not what the old public school was; it is only very moderate compared with what it was, even in my own day. There is one very important matter which concerns the life of all of us, and that is the tone and character which a public school gives to a boy. It is the tone and character which I received in my schooling to which I am indebted for my success in my profession as a judge, as a King's counsel, and as a lieut.-colonel. I believe I have advanced more because of the tone which was given to me in the public school than by any other means of education. That is the first thing of all—learn to be a British gentleman, and that is what the public school teaches above all other things. Then, as an old public school boy I fully appreciated the physical training I received. I joined in the football at Harrow, and the benefit I received thereby was that I not only obtained physical strength, but health, the first consideration of life. What is life without health? I believe that physical training is necessary in our schools, and that football, cricket, and rowing are essentially necessary for the attainment of health and physical development. The scrimmage in the football field teaches a boy to be courageous; it teaches him the nobility of self-sacrifice—to rush in where the danger is thickest. What are the lecturer's words? He says: "Sheer physical courage, a quick eye for opportunity, and the power of inspiring confidence amongst his men, were, perhaps, some of the chief characteristics of a successful regimental officer." What is an officer if he cannot inspire confidence in his men? What would Nelson have been if he had not inspired confidence in them? They did what he told them to do, because they knew he was to be depended on. What I desire to emphasise is that the first thing we have to do is to train up boys so that they shall be physically strong, so that they shall be healthy. As an old public school boy I have accepted the challenge of Lord Ellenborough to "stick up for your school."

Major E. C. HAWKSHAW, R.A. (retired) :—May I be allowed to say a few words on this interesting subject, having been through the entire mill bearing upon it? Fox hunting, entailing blowing a horn, I began my military career as a bugler in the Harrow School Rifle Corps, the only post in the British Army for which my age of 13 years, with stature to match, qualified me. Later on I shot for my house with Martin Hunter, afterwards in the Coldstream Guards; at times also for the school. Then

came a crammer, followed by the R.M.A. and 22 years of R.H.A. and R.A. The question is: "What constitutes a good officer?" I thoroughly agree with the last speaker, that first of all he must be a gentleman, and to this I beg to add that he must be a thoroughly trained *man*, who bases his carrying out of the King's Regulations on the Ten Commandments—the foundation of all law, military and civil. The question of religion has arisen during this discussion. I feel sure that it will be agreed with that an officer with good sound religious training inculcated at home and at school will possess backbone and confidence, and command most influence for good with his subordinates. The selection of officers for different billets cannot be too carefully carried out. "The education of officers for the Army" is the cry of the day. I maintain that there are any number serving who have all the making of leaders of men, and now that the Army bids fair to be run on business principles, these men will doubtless be taken advantage of, and not ignored and repressed as was formerly the case. I am much in favour of public schools in preference to cadet schools, urged by some reformers. They enlarge the mind, and I am at a loss to think of a better scheme for success in the soldier's career than a large, good public school with general education, comprising the dead languages to teach the derivation of words, up to a certain point, then the modern side as we had at Harrow. I also urge drill and the use of a rifle for every boy in the school; to be taught so many hours a week during school hours. Under the above conditions the cramming system, for which no good word escapes me, is needless, and sound manly habits accompany the boy through the school straight into the Army, which will profit accordingly.

Colonel G. C. KITSON, C.V.O., C.M.G.:—As I happen to be Commandant at Sandhurst, I thought it might be of interest if I pointed out some of the defects of public school education as they appear to me; I see the results. The lecturer has spoken of originality and individuality. That is where our boys fail so signally. They are not taught to think, they cannot formulate ideas, they cannot make plans. On the other hand, the public school training leads to excellent memories. The memories of the boys are very good. In working up for an examination they will get up a mass of ideas, which they will put under the headings of (a), (b), (c), and (d), etc. They are taught a *memoria technica*, by which to remember these headings, and that is all. I do not think that this is the class of training which we want in an officer. If we have to take up a defensive position, and start to think of the headings in "Combined Training" and our *memoria technica*, I do not think our defensive position will be a success. Then Lord Ellenborough said that the public school boys were taught to hold a pen. I can only say my experience is that boys at the present day do not know how to hold a pen at all. They can neither write nor speak English; their composition is very bad, and their conversation is very much worse. As a staff officer I have always found that the faculty one wants most of all is to be able to describe events that one has seen. I only wish we had had some training at school which had taught us how to do that. If anybody was to see one of my classes struggling at their lessons they would realise that our boys cannot write. In a staff officer nothing can be of more importance than that he should be able to write quickly and legibly, and I can only say that at the present day our boys are not taught to do so at public schools.

Captain LEWIS BUTLER (late King's Royal Rifle Corps) :—I only wish very briefly to touch upon one or two points in the paper. First of all, I should like to ask Mr. Tracy whether he has read Dr. Shadwell's recently published book entitled "Industrial Efficiency." If he has not done so he will find that it gives a second and a different side to the idea of American education, and he will find that American education is probably very much more partial than he seems to think. Mr. Tracy mentioned in one paragraph a quotation from a gentleman who pointed out how very much better the Boer was than the British officer; but he did not mention what perhaps is not always known, viz., that our Colonial forces invariably begged to be commanded, not by Colonials, but by British officers. He also mentioned the idea of patriotism. Patriotism, Sir, is in England to some extent an abstract idea. France has been invaded; the Frenchman knows what it is to die for his country; Germany has been invaded; Russia has been invaded; Austria has been invaded; and all the inhabitants of those countries know how to die for their country. England, on the other hand, has never been invaded since the days of William the Conqueror, and consequently, as I say, patriotism is an abstract idea. Dr. Miller Maguire and the lecturer have both discussed the question of the public schools; but I would venture to ask whether we ought not to go into it a little more deeply. We say that the boys are not taught what they ought to be taught. Then who are the teachers? The teachers are professors who have come almost exclusively from Oxford and Cambridge; and what are Oxford and Cambridge? Oxford and Cambridge are two Universities which arrogate to themselves a monopoly of education. Some little time ago I was speaking to a schoolmaster about a public school where a new headmaster was being selected, and I said to him, half in joke: "What would you think of so-and-so?" mentioning a man who had been most successful in military education. His answer quite astounded me. He said: "What, would you have an uneducated man for such a position?" My nominee had been a most admirable staff officer; he knew the Empire from east to west; he had been attaché at a Continental Court, and he had been on friendly terms with monarchs. He had, as I say, had the greatest possible experience of military education, and yet he was called an uneducated man! And who are the people who arrogate to themselves the right to say such things? Oxford and Cambridge are Universities which I think may be described as old monastic anachronisms, which, even if they have been improved of late, are still perhaps four centuries behind the times. What is their dress? Their dress is that of the scholar of the fourteenth or fifteenth century. Who in the world can help laughing when you see a person running about in a cap and gown? What should we think if the Army were dressed like beef-eaters? and yet that is not in the least more absurd than the present habits and ideas of the Universities. I am told that only recently the Bishop of London went down to preach at Oxford against the vice of drunkenness. Is there any community in the world, excepting a University, to which a bishop would have to speak on the point? Lastly, I was very much amused some time ago at seeing a notice that the Crown Prince of Siam had received a University education, and everyone was enormously pleased, because they said: "How nice it is to see the civilisation of the West brought into contact with the East." A friend of mine, after he had left, met a distinguished Siamese, and asked him how they were getting along in Siam. "Oh," he said, "we are jogging along very well." Then my friend said: "What about those horrible

barbarous tortures in Siam?" "Oh," he said, "we should have got rid of them by this time but for the personal intervention of the Crown Prince of Siam, lately a graduate of Balliol College!" When we have such things as these before us, I really think we must ask ourselves whether we ought not to go to the root of the matter; whether there is not still further room for improvement in our own Universities. And until we see such improvements, are we right to expect much better from our public schools?

The Rev. F. W. TRACY, in reply, said:—I should like, first of all, to tender my very hearty thanks to the speakers who have criticised my poor lecture, and for the very sympathetic manner in which they have spoken. If I may be allowed to refer to some of the special remarks that have been made, and not to go into the matter in detail, I should like to say that there appear to me to be running through the speakers' minds two opinions in the main. One opinion is, that Cadet Schools are things absolutely not to be thought of if anything can possibly be done to prevent them, because a Cadet School would be a class school; and the other opinion is precisely the reverse. The reason for the opinion in favour of Cadet Schools is, that the public schools and the Universities—because you must practically, at the present time, unite those two things—are either not progressive, or not sufficiently progressive. I endeavoured in my lecture to indicate that I did not think a Cadet School was a thing absolutely to be desired in the abstract. What I tried, as a humble layman, to prove was, that, so far as one can judge from the trend of modern conditions in relation to warfare, we have to face this practical fact, that if we do not turn out more of the highly-educated professional class of officer on the average than we do at present, and if we are not able to rely upon our public schools, and I will say on our Universities, for a more satisfactory output from that point of view, we are going to pay for it. And I submit that any amount of sentiment is nothing against that. It is said that a class school is an undesirable thing. I daresay it may be; I really do not know precisely why, but I have a sort of feeling that it may be. But I think a much more undesirable thing would be a disastrous defeat of the Empire's forces which modified the whole position of our Empire. Speaking as an average citizen, I am ready to face any amount of the disagreeable or objectionable effects of militarism rather than find the Empire going down because we were not quick enough to adapt ourselves to the requirements of the age. I am afraid I do believe really, for what my poor opinion is worth, that the whole system of Cadet Schools is practically a business necessity at the present minute, and, I am very sorry to say it. I set the highest value on public school training, as I have tried to indicate, so far as it goes; I set the highest value, as I also tried to indicate, on the old classical training, but that has gone for ever—there are no real classics nowadays at all; I set the highest value on real athletics, properly carried out, but we are drifting more and more into the condition in which so many play and so many more look on! That is not good enough. The long and short of it is, I do most strongly urge that we need to drop sentiment; we need to look at the thing dispassionately, and in the most business-like way we can. I do not set the American boy up as a model. I have not alluded at all to one very serious side of the education question in America. The reason of the American boy's superiority in certain respects, I can quite believe, is the reason that was given—a young country, great scope, and keen competition. But I think it comes back to this; granted that the

public schools are not totally ignorant of these modern conditions, which we believe to be required, granted the fact that they are anxious to improve, we still have to face the question: Are they going to improve fast enough or are they not? Whether it is true or not one does not know, but more than once within the last few years it is said that the Empire has been right on the verge, I had almost said trembling on the verge, of a big international conflict, something before which the Boer War would have been child's play. If it is not true that we have been on the verge of war, at any rate we cannot have been very far off it; and that we have escaped what the Empire, under present conditions, is not ready to face, is what an ordinary man would call luck—have we any right to say Providence? I was very much struck by the strength of the opinion that the ideal training would be that in which vigorous and reformed public schools had universal military training right through them, and the argument that therefore we do not need specialised Cadet Schools. That sort of public school is the thing we need if we can get it. But whilst I heartily support that idea, I come back to this prosaic question: Are we going to get what is needed for the Army soon enough? I will not say: Are we going to get it at all? No doubt it would be a great comfort to us if we could drift along for some years without any fierce attack upon the Empire, which would shake us to the very core; no doubt it would be a great comfort to us, at the very extreme limit of our earthly existence, to see that in a few years' time education will be so efficient that there will be no question whatever as to the best material being available for military service. That is all very pleasant no doubt, but suppose a European war broke out the day after to-morrow, where are we? That is the question to think about. Therefore, I urge most strongly that one Cadet School, which would give us a centre of reference, handled by real thinkers, not in the least influenced by fashion or anything of the kind, would probably be the making of our public school education, in the thick of which are numbers of men who want reform, numbers of boys who would do far more than they do do if they only had the chance. A Cadet School of that kind I firmly believe would go a long way towards being a national insurance for us. Failing that, I believe we shall be carrying the insurance on our own shoulders, and not, if I may put it so, on a premium which would not cost us very much. I could say a great deal more as to the conditions and so on of the average boy in the public school. There is not, at this moment, enough of the best sort coming out of the public schools into the service, and I firmly believe we cannot get that best sort fast enough. Therefore, I urge that we not only need all the progress that can be brought into our public schools, and all the progress that can be brought into our Universities, but we need a definite pattern, and we need that definite pattern the day after to-morrow, if we cannot get it to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN (Major-General H. D. Hutchinson, C.S.I.):—I am sure you will agree that we have listened to a most interesting lecture, and I am sure you will equally agree that the discussion which has followed it is full of instruction and suggestion, which I hope will bear fruit in many directions later on. I have very little to add myself to what has been already said by so many able speakers; I will therefore keep you only a very few minutes. With regard to the proposal to establish Cadet Schools, I must say that I have not made up my mind on the subject yet—I have an open mind. I have not, to be frank, given much thought to the subject before to-day, but I am not prepared, so far as I

can see at present, to say that a Cadet School is necessary. My own feeling is for free trade in the matter of the supply of raw material for the Army. I believe the present arrangement by which anybody can compete for the Army, from the public schools, from the Universities, from the Colonies, and so forth, is an excellent one, but I do not think at present it has quite a fair chance. But that is because we do not possess yet a great military training college, such as a great military nation ought to have. Sandhurst ought to hold at least double the present number of cadets. A cadet is supposed to be trained there for two years, and with the class of boy who now comes into the college, I think the training imparted in that time would make him a really first-rate officer. But if the cadets remain for two years at Sandhurst, the output of the College (which accommodates only 360) must be very small. Hence, a shortage of officers; so, in order to accelerate the output, we have had temporarily to reduce the period of residence and training from two years to one year. That is unfortunate. It is not fair to the cadets; it is not fair to the parents; it is not fair to the commandant; and it is not fair to the professors. Obviously, it is very difficult indeed to arrange a proper curriculum of study when you do not know whether the cadets will stay for two years, eighteen months, or twelve months. With regard to the Universities, I must say they have responded excellently, and with the best spirit, to the invitation and the encouragement which we have been able to give them from the War Office. Oxford and Cambridge are now sending up candidates to the Army of a good stamp, and Dublin also is furnishing good material. These three Universities have formed military classes, and are steadily registering undergraduates on their military lists. The whole scheme at present is quite in its infancy, but it is full of promise. Therefore, I think the prospect of getting good material from the public schools, from the Universities, and from the Colonies, is sufficiently good; and I doubt if a Cadet School is really necessary in addition to these sources of supply. I admit, however, there are many "precious possibilities" connected with the establishment of a Cadet School, and I should like to see the question further and fully threshed out. There is one passage in Mr. Tracy's lecture which I think is of great interest. He said: "The selection and treatment of bookwork subjects I purposely avoid discussing. I am anxious to speak of qualities rather than precise learning; of education rather than instruction. It may be said that such qualities and characteristics as have been indicated are largely a matter of temperament. I urge most strongly that the qualities of a man are largely a matter of training, far more largely than is recognised in practice, and that the attainment of a high common standard would bring special aptitudes also to a still higher point." I think that is a very important opinion, and I entirely agree with it. I think much more might be done at our schools, at our public schools in particular, to inculcate *habits* and *methods* of work. I think the methods and habits of work are of much more importance than the work itself. How few boys there are who really have learned how to approach their studies methodically. Industry is of little avail unless it is applied with method. That is the rule with all work, and I therefore think much more might, and ought to be done in schools to inculcate *habits of work*, and *method in study*. That is all I have to say, except that it affords me now great pleasure to ask you to accord a very hearty vote of thanks, signifying your wish in the usual way, to Mr. Tracy for the most excellent lecture he has given us.

Admiral the Hon. Sir EDMUND R. FREMANTLE, G.C.B., C.M.G. (Rear-Admiral of the United Kingdom):—I desired to say a few words in the course of the discussion, but there were so many speakers that I was not able to. I think the great problem we have before us, which Mr. Tracy has so thoroughly and capably dealt with, is that we desire to interest the boys in their studies, and at the same time not spoil their imaginative and receptive faculties. That plan is carried out in the United States more or less, and we endeavour to do it in the Navy at Osborne, by giving the boys a certain amount of manual training while they are carrying out their ordinary school lessons. That, I believe, is of the very greatest importance. It affords me very great pleasure to propose a vote of thanks to the Director of Staff Duties, who has been good enough to come here and support Mr. Tracy in giving us this extremely instructive and suggestive lecture.