

This article was downloaded by: [University of Liverpool]

On: 02 January 2015, At: 08:18

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>

On Military Education in England from a National and an Imperial Point of View

T. Miller Maguire LL.D

Published online: 11 Sep 2009.

To cite this article: T. Miller Maguire LL.D (1902) On Military Education in England from a National and an Imperial Point of View, Royal United Services Institution. Journal, 46:294, 1007-1046, DOI: [10.1080/03071840209416114](https://doi.org/10.1080/03071840209416114)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03071840209416114>

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>



ON MILITARY EDUCATION IN ENGLAND FROM A NATIONAL AND AN IMPERIAL POINT OF VIEW.¹

By *T. MILLER MAGUIRE, LL.D., Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.*

Friday, 4th July, 1902.

General E. H. CLIVE, *p.s.c.*, in the Chair.

THE question of education generally is now very much before people of all classes, and, indeed, is the subject-matter of elaborate discussions in the Imperial Parliament. In point of fact, a general opinion prevails—and I am afraid it is too well founded—that if the English do not forthwith proceed to set their educational house in order, especially in regard to what is generally known as secondary education, and with regard to technical education also, bad times await the English portion of the British people. This, I am sorry to say, is a serious state of affairs, to which attention has been directed for many years by competent observers—commercial, military, and social—almost in vain. I am very much afraid indeed that the present Cabinet, and, indeed, all our present officials and past officials, have much to seek in regard to interest in this most vital of all questions. Even if we were not in an age of competition, the education and training of the youth would appear to a sage person one of the most serious possible considerations. I really fail to be able to put myself in the place of a parent who is not spending a considerable portion of his time weighing and considering by what process he may enable his offspring to realise the high ideal which Shakespeare and Milton—not to speak of sacred writers—have placed before the human race.

But in an age of competition I am at a still greater loss to know by what process of reasoning the people at the head of our State have been enabled to justify to themselves for so long a period the neglect of the primary duty of the parent and of the State: that is to say, the duty of seeing after the education and the training of all classes of the community. That they do not realise this, that even our present Government—every member of which has had the opportunities of a splendid and costly education, and many of whom have homes which

¹This lecture was delivered *extempore*.

are practically hereditary libraries—does not recognise the awful importance of this subject is clearly set forth in one of the ministerial organs only two days ago. I quote that ministerial organ deliberately, but exactly the same doctrines are set forth in opposition organs. The Press of the nation is unanimous with regard to the necessity for a sound system of secondary education. All the magazines, the journals of the men on 'Change, all the best writers, are unanimous that we must have a sound secondary education as a basis of sound technical education, and that forthwith. I might quote all the papers, but I quote only one. I do not refer to the religious part of the controversy at all—I do not care anything about it. In regard to certain sectarian zeal, I think a zealous desire to promote education would be a very much better thing. I omit, therefore, all reference to the religious controversy at present raging. But the *Morning Post* of 2nd July says:—"It is a misfortune that the Education Bill is not in charge of a Minister conversant with the subject"—mark you, education is the most vital of all subjects, and this is a ministerial organ—"and acquainted with the course of educational thought during the past fifty years." If you have not spent your time thinking about education, you are scarcely fit to deal practically with education. "Mr. Balfour's idea seems to be that, provided an Education Bill is carried, it does not much matter what is in the Bill so long as it is agreeable to the right wing of his own supporters." This is a curious idea. "That is an attitude intelligible only on the supposition that the people of England are indifferent to the subject of education." Are they! I do not think they are. There seems to be a considerable number of people very anxious about education, or such a distinguished audience would not assemble here to-day in London when the great Olympian game of cricket is being played only a few hundred yards away. "But the thinking portion of the community, and its working portion, are not indifferent. There is a very widespread conviction that a great change for the better is urgently needed, especially in the matter of secondary education." The Ministry "may use its majority to reject amendments and to press its Bill through the Committee, but the result will be to alienate from its party the very large and growing class of citizens who care little for the traditional distinctions of party, but a great deal for great and pressing national needs, among which an efficient organisation of secondary education is by universal admission paramount." Now, if that is granted, a great part of the difficulties in the way of the course of my lecture disappears.

But for fear I may be accused of quoting only politicians, I take the opportunity of also quoting others in regard to this matter of secondary education, which is the bed-rock of the whole matter on which all technical education, military and other, depends; for I contend that if a man at the

age of 19 or 20 is not acquainted with certain fundamental educational facts he is scarcely fit for civilised society either in England or on the Continent or anywhere. There must be a certain kind of Freemasonry among educated and intelligent men to whom serious interests are entrusted, and these Freemasons cannot associate unless they have certain signs, and these signs are to be found in the broad principles of general secondary education. I contend that if you only had a good, sound system of secondary education up to a certain point for architects, artists, and soldier-officer men, barristers, solicitors, and so forth, you would facilitate public intercourse to a degree, and you would be able to build on this cultivated intelligence the more special education which each of these men requires. Therefore, if we had a good secondary system of education, we should soon have a good auxiliary technical system of professional education.

We have a bishop in the audience, and I take it that a bishop ought to be a very good judge of education. Very often a bishop is a gentleman who has had some practical experience of educational affairs in public schools or elsewhere; in any case, educating the soul is so closely connected with educating the mind, and the two are so correlated, that a man would be a very inferior teacher of immortal principles unless he could look back to the immortal productions of past literature and to the philosophy of all ages. I am, therefore justified in thinking that a bishop may be a sound exponent of the general principles of education as accepted in all civilised countries. The bishop whom I quote has not only the advantage of being a bishop in England, but he also has been bishop in the Colonies. This bishop could also reflect the opinion, not only of these small central isles, but the opinion of the enormous territories which have expanded from these central isles. Now, listen to the Bishop of Manchester. He has another advantage, viz., that his daily work brings him close to the thought of the merchant princes of our race. Listen to him. He says, preaching in Manchester Cathedral, on "England in the New Century," that is to say, England in this century—that "England was committed in the new century to a trade conflict more intense than any in which she has hitherto been engaged." Now, then, a very natural question for a bishop dealing with tradesmen and merchants was: "Are we prepared for this encounter?" His answer is that we are not. Therefore, if we are not, is it not clearly the duty of every considering person to see that as soon as possible we are? What is the remedy? Why are we not? How will we be? When will we be? He says that we are not prepared because we are deficient in knowledge, in skill, in enterprise—that is bad enough, is it not, for Manchester? Our methods are old-fashioned. He is a Conservative, and so am I; but we can be conservative a little too far.

We are too easy and self-confident. We rely rather on the great position we have attained in the past than on the readiness to meet accumulated difficulties in the future. We care too much for sport and amusement. We care far too little for work. And it is quite clear that the bishop, whose duty it is to show that we must earn our bread by the sweat of our brow, and how we ought to get no bread except by such sweat, is justified in saying that work should form our occupation, our discipline, and our delight. But he goes on to say only too truly:—"But another twenty years of lazy, foolish, self-complacency would cost us more than our pride of commercial place—might indeed cost us our national prosperity, if not our national independence. What must we do? Educate the leaders of our national industries; make our children good linguists; teach them methods of trade; and encourage the study of arts and sciences." I might almost stop, having read these words, believing that I have said enough, as they apply to the soldier man fully as much as to the commercial man; but, I will go on quoting:—"In other words, in the new century, self-control, self-sacrifice, patience in labour, and religious faith were required of Britishers."

Now, in my mind the first position is that we want a good system of secondary education, and that we must try to get it forthwith; that if we do get it, with the splendid qualities which the English part of the community, as well as the Scotch, Welsh, and Irish portions, have inherited through the wonderful industry and foresight of their predecessors—if we do get it forthwith we can face the new century in a new way, with great courage.

The notion which prevails that a soldier man, especially the leader of soldier men, the officer man, may be of all men of his rank and position with impunity the least thoughtful, the least learned man, is a new notion, and is a foolish notion. It is my duty occasionally to take care of my neighbours, but I take care of my neighbours in time of ease. It is the officer man's duty to take care of his humbler neighbours in time of stress and adversity, in times of danger, when he requires all his wits, all his nerves, all his manhood, all his reminiscences of the past, and all his hopes of the future, to enable him to do his duty with anything like credit to himself, fidelity to those who trust him, or fidelity to the interests of the nation whose affairs are in his charge. There is no man who has such responsibility as the officer man, none; there is no man whose mistakes are so final, so irrevocable, so far-reaching, so terrible. And, surely, of all men, this is the man who wants education at its altitude.

What do I mean by education? I mean by education the development of everyone of his faculties as far as he is able to develop them. I mean physical education at its very best. If he is not a strong man, he could still be an officer. If he is a strong man, he can be a better

officer, just as he could be a better barrister, a better trader, better in any walk of life for strength of body. We are not given a body merely to waste any more than we are given the divine faculty of reason to allow it to fust in us unused. Therefore the training of the body of the officer is a consideration for the parents—the father and the mother. Is there anyone in this room who will get up and deny that the physical training of the officer man, and the moral training of the officer man, are not most important to the officer man and most important to the State? I do not think anyone will attempt to do anything of the kind.

And I must say this. I have lived with soldiers—officers, sergeants, privates, men of the highest ranks in the Army, veterans of our past campaigns, young boys scarcely fully formed, boys scarcely fully formed going forth in manly fashion to meet death; I am quite well acquainted with the sergeants of the British Army, the backbone of the British Army, for whom too much cannot be done in the British Army; and I am acquainted with the privates; and it has been also my duty to survey most of the best Armies in the world; taking our men all in all, they are excellent men from the physical point of view; and having regard to the frailties of human nature and the temptations to military men, on the whole these soldiers are a credit to the British community wherever they are located in the British Empire—men of all ranks. But I go further, and I say that: if it is necessary for a German man in command, or for a French man in command, or a Russian man in command, to be careful about his health—physical and moral—and to be very careful about his abilities and his knowledge, it is ten times more important for the British soldier man to be careful of all these.

But just look at the most striking difference between the soldiers of our nation and the soldiers of any other nation. Just see what the British sailor men and the British soldier men have been obliged to do for their nation, and have done willingly for their nation, in the reign of Queen Victoria alone. Look at the expansion in Africa. Look at the expansion not so much, but still enormous, in India, from the Indus to the Pamirs. Look at the expansion in Australia. I do not say that the soldiers did all that, but it was under the *ægis* of the soldier man that it was all done. It could not be done without him or without the sailor—the man of the sea. What is the sailor man but a soldier man fighting aboard ship? One is the complement of the other. I have not time to go through the whole of the military experiences of our race in modern days, but what these officers in our Army have been asked to do in the last fifty or sixty years is something simply tremendous in regard to the expansion of our Empire and the duties correlated therewith.

Now take our Army before the war in South Africa. The British officers were stationed outside Africa in no fewer than 142 different posts. Now

there are not 142 active generals; therefore, some person under the rank of general must have been responsible for these posts. Many of these posts were in the hands of quite young men; and, therefore, it may be taken that every young British officer may at any moment be in a position of responsibility which few senior German or French officers could be called upon to assume. If that be so, if it is desirable—and everyone in Germany thinks it is desirable—that a German officer should be a good man of the body, a good man of the hand, and a good man of the brain, it is clearly more desirable that the British officer of the same age and of the same rank should be a better man, if possible, in all three. Moreover, any of us who have gone about in the Indian and Colonial camps during the last few days must have reflected—if we can think at all; unless we too are uneducated, unless we too have allowed our memories and imaginations, and reasons to fust in us unused—must have had matter for serious thought and have been struck to a degree by the great diversities of creeds and races managed and handled so skilfully and manfully by their young officers. I was never so proud of the fact that I have been for many years connected with and, to some extent, responsible for the development of young officers than when I saw some of these very officers coming back from the Hindu Kush, coming back from Nepal, coming back from the Malay Peninsula and Darkest Africa, in charge of men of every race and creed and colour. All these strange folk under the care of our officers are winning now in London the esteem of their Anglo-Saxon fellow citizens for their soldierly qualities. I want to bring home to you that if there are any men in this world who are bound to look after themselves and the faculties which God has given them, these men are the British officers in charge of the different posts of the British Empire. Our Cabinet should cherish them; they are priceless.

And from the mere point of fighting, consider this matter. How many campaigns have the Germans fought since the accession of the reign of her late Majesty Queen Victoria? I see before me an authority on this point, Colonel Lonsdale Hale, and I must be very careful; but I will not exaggerate or set anything down in malice. Have they been engaged in ten, Colonel Hale, since 1837? Colonel Hale thinks they have; but I am perfectly certain they have not. I doubt if they were engaged in half that number. But I hand my audience a record of what the British Army did in the same time: eighty-two different campaigns in the space of one reign!

Now, I hope I have proved that if other races require to be well educated, the soldiers of the British race require to be well educated, and that it is the duty of the State to spare no expense and no pains to see that they get every possible opportunity, if they are willing to use it, of being educated from the secondary and from the technical point of view.

Now, I do not hesitate to assert that the 'State has not given them the opportunity, or anything approaching the opportunities, that their merits deserve. I suppose soldiers do not like to be referred occasionally to poets and philosophers, the most unpractical of all men; whereas a soldier poses as being, and ought to be, one of the most practical.

But still there is no harm occasionally in learning something from an outsider, and one of the best men of genius and critics of our race in modern times has been Mr. Ruskin. He was highly appreciated, apparently, by the military authorities some time ago, and Mr. Ruskin was asked to deliver lectures to the cadets at Woolwich. I am glad to see that the cadets at Woolwich have come relatively scatheless out of certain recent searching enquiries. Mr. Ruskin wrote a book based on his lectures, called "The Crown of Wild Olive." A more admirable book one could scarcely read, and this book, dealing with the education of soldiers, contains the following phrase:—"A young mathematician may be excused for langour in studying curves to be described only with a pencil, but not in tracing those which are to be described with a rocket. Your knowledge of a wholesome herb may involve the feeding of an army; and acquaintance with an obscure point of geography the success of a campaign. Never waste an instant's time, therefore; the sin of idleness is a thousandfold greater in you than in other youths; FOR THE FATES OF THOSE WHO WILL ONE DAY BE UNDER YOUR COMMAND HANG UPON YOUR KNOWLEDGE; LOST MOMENTS NOW WILL BE LOST LIVES THEN, AND EVERY INSTANT WHICH YOU CARELESSLY TAKE FOR PLAY YOU BUY WITH BLOOD." Such are the words of Ruskin with regard to the necessity for a most careful and intelligent system of military education.

Now, it has struck certain people within the last few years that, somehow or other, our soldiers are not educated enough; and whatever another responsible institution near at hand may think about this matter, the Royal United Service Institution is absolutely blameless. "Let the galled jade wince, our withers are unwrung." Every suggestion that is in the Report of the Committee on Education and Training of Officers of the Army was repeated over and over again in advance in this hall by venerable officers like Lord Wemyss, by Colonel Lonsdale Hale, by officers of the Militia and Volunteers, and recently by Colonel Legard, Colonel Dooner, Colonel Cave, and Captain Lee. Over and over again was this done, and not the slightest attention was paid to a remark by one of these persons till certain deplorable incidents occurred in South Africa. This is not a wise fashion of managing the business of a State. The reason why men are made Cabinet Ministers and War Office officials is to be wise betimes. *Para bellum in pace*. You must be wise in time. Our rulers were not wise in time. I do not know how far any disasters—

we have not had any official enquiry yet—were or were not due to ignorance; but I know this, that neither with regard to ranges, nor with regard to foresight as to artillery, nor with regard to manœuvring ground, nor with regard to a thousand other matters which I have not time to mention now, did our War Office or our Cabinet display any foresight whatever. The officers of from 22 to 40 years of age never had any chance of learning their business, although their representatives here and elsewhere had implored the Government again and again to give them a chance of learning their business. Is that true or is that not true? In regard to future criticism, I lay down this theorem: Let it be granted that everyone of the “lessons of the war,” so called, with regard to smokeless powder, magazine weapons, the necessity for the study of topography, maps, general training of troops, tactical movements new or old, mounted infantry, was insisted upon over and over again. I am only a civilian, and a manœuvring ground may be or may not be a good thing; if it is a good thing, the Government were told so often enough, goodness knows. Practising how to make earthworks may be a good thing or a bad thing; if it is a good thing, the Government were told so often enough. Now some people come and blame the officers of the Army under the rank of colonel in regard to these very matters which were thus years ago set forth. I say that to blame those officers and to let the Government and the Cabinet and the senior men in the War Office pass unscathed is to befool the nation and to be unfair to the officers.

But in regard to the action of the Royal United Service Institution and the gentlemen whom I see before me, not one man of them, from the oldest to the youngest, for the last ten years in this Institution has failed of doing his duty. I say “Let the galled jade wince” over there in the Parliament House or in the War Office as much as it likes; and the more it winces the more I am pleased—“our withers are unwrung.”

I am not going to quote the Report, because I do not see there is anything new in the Report. The Report is a belated document. The Commissioners sat and made their Report; they did their duty splendidly. I see that a gentleman over there does not agree with me. My opinion is that the gentlemen in charge of this work did their duty well; that is my opinion. They examined 70 witnesses or more. They began sitting in May and continued sitting at intervals until December. They told the truth in the love thereof, but they did not tell anything new. Why? Because there was nothing new to tell. It had been all published over and over again in the JOURNAL of the Royal United Service Institution. The British people being isolated by command of the sea do not feel war like other peoples, but they felt this South African war a little more than

they had felt any recent wars; it came home more to their business and their bosoms, and they began to think more of the lessons. They had forgotten the lessons of the Crimean war, which were bad enough, and almost the same in some particulars. They would not hearken to the voice of us charmers, charmed we ever so wisely in this hall, till they suffered some reverses.

Then they were startled, and they wanted an enquiry, and they appointed a Commission, and to their astonishment they got plenty out of a Commission this time. They got a true, laborious, honest Commission that did not care a bit for conventionalities apparently, and startled them still more by the production of this valuable Report. But it is clear to me that some of my friends in the hall will get fidgety if I quote from the Report, and, therefore, I will not do so.

But the Report is based on information regarding general preparatory rather than technical education. Here are some curious facts, statements made long before the Report. "I wish to draw attention to the fact that the writing and spelling of many of the junior officers [of Militia] is very indifferent." Mark you, in an age of school boards, when everybody is paying for the education of everybody all round, that body's son has very indifferent writing and spelling! That is a curious thing. That is not the fault of the colonels of the Army; that is not the fault of the young officer himself. He did not teach himself how to write or spell. If he did, he would have taught himself perhaps even more curiously than this. This is the fault of somebody else. Of whom is this the fault? We shall see. "As many of these officers have joined the Militia with the view of obtaining commissions in the Regular Army, I hope you will consider it worth while bringing this fact to the notice of HEAD MASTERS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS, as, considering the amount the parents pay for their education, the result is not at all satisfactory." That is the very beginning of education—reading and writing. And the report is by whom? By the Headquarter Staff at Aldershot. When? After the war had gone on nearly a year—the 24th October, 1900.

But I have another quotation from the summary of Sir C. Grove's Report on the Militia Examination held in September, 1901. 250 Militia officers, mark you, underwent examination for 110 commissions in the Regular Army. Of these, according to the summary, only 23 knew any tactics or military law—fancy officers who did not know any tactics—and none had any opportunity of learning modern history or English history. Now, one of the great merits of the Report is that it sets forth what the German Emperor says, what the leading Russians say, what the United States say, it sets forth what the Frenchman says: that no man can call

himself a gentleman, or ought to be allowed to call himself an officer either in France, or Germany, or Russia, or England, or the United States, who is absolutely ignorant of the traditions, the history, the geography, the laws, the institutions, of the country which he professes to defend.

Now we come to ancient classics. I believe that an enormous amount can be learned from the proper study of ancient classics, and in my humble way I suggest that Latin should be retained. But what Latin? Not tomfoolery Latin. The traditions of the Latin race, how to translate a Latin author, how to understand that map of Imperial Rome, how to follow the career of a man like Julius Cæsar, how to follow the jurisprudence of Justinian. How to follow the philosophy and poetry of these great Greeks, Plato and others. That is the true spirit of the classics. That is the spirit of the classics which the German Emperor advocates, a summary of whose views I have not time to read, but which are set forth in Appendix VI. I asked a gentleman the other day who had been four years studying Greek to translate four lines of Xenophon, and he could not translate one. Is that learning Greek? It is a farce to say a man is learning Greek who cannot translate any Greek author after four years. He is trifling away his time, not learning. At the age of 16 I had read most of Homer, Euripides, Æschylus, Xenophon, and others. Another gentleman had been six years at Latin, and could not translate six lines of Virgil or Horace. Do you call that learning Latin? Hear what the German Emperor said: "Away with this rubbish! War to the knife against such teaching! The result of this system is that our school-boys 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 1866 and 1870, which they have not 'yet had'!"!!!

I know men who know all about the battles of the Punic war and the battles in the war between the Spartans and the Phœnicians, but they never heard of the siege of Badajoz or of the battle of the Alma, or the career of Havelock, and know very little about the Afghan campaigns of Lord Roberts. What kind of education is that? Is not that poor instruction and no education? Education is to draw out what is in a man, to develop the faculties of a man, to encourage the curiosity of a man, to stimulate the enthusiasm of a man. Keeping a man at syntax from 14 to 16—is that the way to stimulate his enthusiasm? And, remember, unless he is an enthusiast, whether he is a teacher or a scholar, he is not worth a farthing for progress. According to Sir C. Grove's Report, as to ancient classics—though the great majority were at public schools

—a large number of the Latin papers were poor, and but two or three candidates were equal to the Greek. With regard to higher mathematics, no candidate did any work to which it was possible to assign marks. In easy French only eleven candidates could score 50 per cent. Of the successful candidates for the Royal Artillery, only three took up German, and of these two got less than 350 marks out of 2,000. In an easy paper on Geography up to the standard of a nursery class, less than one in five got marks. One officer who passed got 160 marks out of 20,000, and six cavalry officers between them got an aggregate of less than 15,000 marks out of 200,000 in every subject. Well, gentlemen, the Grove Report is a poor Report. There is not much to be proud of in it. This system must be altered, but the young officers are to be pitied rather than blamed.

Now, I say that military education is only a stereotyped form of tastes prevailing for the last twenty years or so, and here if I had time I would quote Dr. Gray, of Bradfield College. Since a certain kind of new rich began to predominate in English society, a kind of rich whom I do not envy and for whom I do not care one straw, and a certain kind of female influence on which I will not dwell began to prevail in the Army, games have also become the principal cult of public schools.

Then all this mischief was introduced. I have already tried to prove this frequently. I like sports, games, riding, and all those kinds of things, as much as anybody. I consider riding an indispensable part of education, if you can afford it. If you cannot afford it, you cannot get it. If you cannot afford some education you have to do with none. But I am speaking of men who can afford it. It is a disgrace for such a man not to be able to ride. I go further, and I hold that horse management and all similar instruction is invaluable. I hold that if a good deal of time spent in play was spent in dealing with horses, and so on, some of our disasters would not have occurred. I mean that a man should be thoroughly a friend of the horse, knowing the horse, loving the horse, using the horse, and getting the horse to know and love him—that is a fine part of education.

But I fail to see how the brain part of the man after all is not the best part of him. Remember that knowledge makes the man—nothing else makes the man. Just look at this. Here is a perfect man:—"What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form, in moving, how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god."—"Hamlet," Act II., Scene 2.

We resemble beasts—and they are very clever and very able in their way—we resemble beasts by our body; but if we resemble not God by our brains, we are, after all, small things, says Lord Bacon. And yet there has prevailed in England for the last 30 or 40 years the monstrous hypothesis that play is education, and in England alone, for it did not

prevail in Ireland, or in Scotland, or in our Colonies; I know that—there are not 20 boys to be found in Belfast, or Galway, or Cork, or amongst the boys who frequent the schools round Edinburgh, whose fathers are small shopkeepers, of whom the Report of the Military Secretary could be written or composed. It is impossible. It only applies to the boys in one place—England; and does not even apply to English School Board boys.

I am going to try and prove that at no period of our history, until recently, did the idea enter into the head of anybody whomsoever that it was a good thing for a boy to spend much of his time after the age of 18 at any play whatsoever. Is that a novelty in this audience? I see it is. Spenser says:—

“Abroad in arms, at home in studious kind,
Who seeks with constant toil shall soonest honour find.”

With regard to the soldier man, fame is the spur. Says one of the greatest of our poets, Milton:—

“Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise
To scorn delights and live laborious days.”

Now you will tell me that the soldiers of England in the past played games. Did they! I can put an end to that argument for evermore. Not one of the great soldiers of our past ever played games after 18 or 19 years of age—the great majority never frequented any public school whatever after the age of 17 and 18. This admits of no discussion and no dispute whatever. Here is a long list of them: Clive, Wolfe, Coote, the makers of our Indian Empire, all were comparatively humble men, went to India young, never played any games, and yet some of them became illustrious persons. Since the battle of Waterloo, Sir Charles Napier, the Lawrences, Havelock, Lord Clyde, Outram, Edwardes, never played any games. John Lawrence was educated at Derry and Clifton and went to India at 17, and Henry Lawrence joined the Artillery at 17, and these were the saviours of our Indian Empire, and they never played any games. Henry Havelock was a most studious officer, and, indeed, before joining the Rifle Brigade, had worked at Law under Chitty, and before going to India had studied Hindustani with Dr. Gilchrist. This did him at least as much good as any games. Campbell, Lord Clyde, was at the Glasgow High School, and went to the Peninsula at 16. After the peace, he devoted himself for years to a sedulous theoretical study of his profession, and yet was as brave as a lion and as good a handler of troops under fire and in campaigning as any man, or as any man who is always playing games. Sir J. Outram was educated at Aberdeen, and went to India at 16. He never played any games, and yet he won the admiration for courage of the wild

border Bhils and became the Bayard of India. The same remark practically applies to Lord Wolseley, Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, Lord Milner, and Mr. Chamberlain, all hard-working men all through. Now if this kind of diseased system of public schools and games and of the cult of athleticism, strongly condemned by Dr. Gray, of Bradfield, has been adverse, even to patriotism—if this kind of thing, instead of rifle-shooting, instead of drill, instead of obligatory military service, instead of the Boys' Brigade, was necessary for success of life, how does it come about that not one of your great men ever practised it at all? And we come to the same thing with regard to the captains of industry. Take up Smiles' "Self-Help." You will not find one of the men that brought England to the front was distinguished by game playing when he was young; not one man connected with any industry or profession whatever.

Now I come to another point. One of the greatest difficulties that we who try to develop a sound system of education in this country have to deal with is this: We are constantly told when we wish to dwell on mental discipline—and mind you always remember that the body is indispensable in military training—when we are dealing with mind training, and education, and thought, and skill, we are constantly told this is all rubbish. I have plenty of articles of that kind here. We are told here, you are turning the English race into bookworms. I have never met an English officer who was a bookworm. I should like to meet one. I do not think I ever knew three men who injured themselves by over-study in my life. We are told that we are going to turn the young and ardent Englishmen into bookworms, and we are told that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. I don't care for Eton one way or other. I have the highest possible regard for the head of the Army Class at Eton, who happens to be a friend of mine; but I say that Wellington never said anything of the kind, and I defy anyone to prove that he ever said anything of the kind. I further say that if he did say it, he would be telling a falsehood, and I will prove it. The famous remark that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton was never uttered by the Duke of Wellington on any occasion, and yet it is used by pedants who have ruined the education of our better classes as a text for justifying their neglect of mental instruction of any kind whatever. We are personally in favour of every manly accomplishment, as Milton was, as Bacon was, as Locke was, as Xenophon was, in their books on education. But I hold that the mental faculties are worthy of as much attention by officers as the muscles, and that no skill in cricket or football is a compensation for complete ignorance in every branch of learning, mathematical, linguistic, historical, political, geographical, and technical. It is a poor excuse if

you do not know anything about Tactics to say that you can play cricket at the age of from 18 to 25; a well-trained imagination and judgment as well as thew and sinew make the perfect man. Utter ignorance embodied in a gentleman causes him to be in his later years a burden to himself, a scandal to his family, and a danger to the State. It is the aim of all education to form a gentleman in all godly discipline, mental as well as physical. Supposing, however, that the great Duke had been so ill-advised as to use the phrase with which he is wrongfully credited, that Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, I contend that he would have apologised at once if the matter had been brought to his attention.

The non-commissioned officers who were the backbone of his army were very important, and they were not in the playing fields, and he remained a very short time at the playing schools himself. The folly of keeping our young men loafing and playing, and learning nothing at school from 16½ to 18½ years of age, was quite unknown to our upper class at the end of the last century. What happened to Lord Wellington himself? When his mother discovered that he was not distinguishing himself either in the playing fields or in the class rooms at Eton, at the age of 15 she removed him to a school at Brussels, and he went for nearly two years to a crammer (Pignerol), where he learned French, German, and physical exercises. Then he went into the Army at 18. And yet he is alleged to have said that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton! ¹

Further, I select twenty of the leading British officers of that day. Sir Dudley Hill was born in Carlow, educated in Ireland, joined the Army at the age of 14, scaled the walls of Monte Video when 16½. Sir John Moore was educated at Glasgow and Geneva, was fairly well up in French, geography and practical geometry at 13, learned Prussian drill at Brunswick, and joined the 51st at 15. Stapleton Cotton, Viscount Combermere, was sent from Westminster to a crammer's—for there were regular military tutors 100 years ago—and joined the 23rd at 17. Sir Thomas Picton was for two years at a French military tutor's house, and was an officer learning Spanish at the age of 15. General Craufurd, the celebrated commander of the Light Division, never went to a public school, and joined the 25th at 13. Sir J. Leith was educated at Aberdeen and at a military tutor's in France, and joined the 21st at 17. Thomas Graham, Lord Lynedoch, was educated by private tutors at home, and joined the Army as a volunteer at the age of 15. Sir James Hope never went to a public school, and joined the 26th at 15. Sir William Erskine

¹ I suppose it will soon be alleged that Lord Roberts, who was at Eton for eight months when he was fourteen years old, and then went to a crammer's (Brackenbury's) for eighteen months, won the Kandahar Campaign at Eton. Lord Wolseley went to private schools in Dublin and played at surveying and carpentry, much to his benefit in the Crimea.

did not go to a public school, and joined the 15th Light Dragoons at 17. Colonel "Dan" Mackinnon joined the Coldstreams at the age of 13. General Sir Galbraith Cole was educated in Ireland, and joined the 12th Light Dragoons at 15. Sir David Baird was educated in Scotland, and joined the 2nd at 15. Marshal Beresford was educated at York and at a military tutor's in France, and joined the 6th at 17. Sir Peregrine Maitland joined the Grenadier Guards at the age of 15. Lord Hardinge did not go to a public school, and joined the Queen's Canadian Rangers at 13. Sir William Napier was educated at Celbridge in Ireland, and joined the Royal Irish Artillery at the age of 14. Sir Charles Napier was educated at Celbridge in Ireland, and obtained a commission in the 33rd at the age of 12. Lord Seaton (Colborne of the 52nd) entered the 20th at 16. Sir Charles Colville did not go to a public school. Sir H. Clinton joined the 11th at 16. Sir E. Pakenham was educated in Ireland, and was a major at 17. Sir Denis Pack was educated in Ireland. Sir William Ponsonby was educated in Ireland, was a major at 22, and colonel of the 5th Dragoon Guards at 26. General Le Marchant was educated at a private school in Bath, served in the Militia, and joined the Royals at the age of 18.

A large portion of those officers were Scotchmen and Irishmen. I am not speaking against the Englishmen or in favour of people educated in Ireland and Scotland, but I do say that the proper place to learn to win battles is the study, and not the playing field. By the "study" I mean the manœuvring fields as much as the library.

Now I will wind up a rather tedious lecture, I fear, by referring to the great soldiers of past ages. We are told that it is usual for a soldier man to be an ignorant man.

I think that I can do much good if a protest against the cult of games to the neglect of brains be the result of this lecture. I want the soldier man to be a thoroughly sound physical man, to be a thoroughly sound man as far as is necessary in topography, field engineering, practical manœuvring, and, above all things, in brain power. Let him also work at horse exercise and new machines like cycles and motors—all that is technical in his profession. He must be a man of curiosity, general intelligence, and general information.

Let us look at the heroes of the past. Take the distinguished heroes of every other race, for example, Greek. Alexander the Great was a most learned gentleman, a wild young man too; but you can be a good cricketer and a rake also. There are rakes and fools in every walk of life, as there are in the Army. Alexander and all his greatest successors till the times of the Romans were literary men and scholars of a high order. Then take the Romans. Everyone of the great emperors, from the first great dictator, Cæsar, on, spent enormous sums on tutors. They

were most devoted to learning of every kind. Ignorance was utterly despised by them. Take the great Mahommedan conquerors, the great leaders of the invasions of India, the great leaders of the holy wars against the Christians, men like Saladin, Timourlane, and others, who were wonderfully adroit scholars, up to all the learning of their age. Take the leading Crusaders:—Richard I. was brought up in all the learning of his age, and he was not one of the best scholars among them. The other Crusaders from France were extremely intelligent. Read the lives of the British soldiers at the Court of Elizabeth. Take men like the great generals in the Thirty Years' War, when military strategy reached its height in Germany. Maurice of Nassau was a fine scholar, and translated Latin authors for the benefit of his troops. Gustavus Adolphus was a well-informed man. Frederick the Great a wonderful man, who carried scholarship to pedantry without Voltaire, and with Voltaire to nonsense; but no doubt he was a fair scholar and a brilliant commander. Take Charles XII., a very ambitious man, a first-class student, a splendid hunter, and a magnificent soldier. Take Napoleon himself, a bookworm; Wellington, a bookworm. Wellington read military literature four hours a day from 1799 to 1819. Might I ask how many military instructors nowadays do that?

These two things go together: general education and technical education. If you hearken to these suggestions of mine, or if some of you do not like this Report, to the suggestions of any other wise men, and begin seriously now and consider, and wish to give all your people an opportunity of acquiring a thoroughly sound secondary education, then do not hesitate for a little expense. Supposing for the sake of £2,000 or £10,000 you spoil manœuvring for a year; and suppose you get 1,000 men killed by ignorance, as each soldier costs £200 to put into battle, for the sake of £10,000 you lose £200,000. In war it is economy to spend wisely, to exercise foresight, to teach men to shoot, to make them accomplished men for their business, because on the efficiency of their business depends not only the lives of their followers, but the life of the State. Do not grudge money on turning out your soldiers as perfect men as they can possibly be. And then have regard to the wonderful linking of the Empire owing to this war: I am quite convinced that the Colonial soldiers, the Indian soldiers, the troops from the Pacific Isles, and from Western and Central Africa, when they are thoroughly convinced that the English gentleman is not only a good sportsman and as brave as a lion, but also a man of learning and judgment, will reverence our great Empire even more than they do at present.

If there is any gentleman here who does not study literature, history, and kindred subjects, I can assure him that he is making a great mistake. On a bed of sickness, literature and history are the greatest comforts a man

can possibly have. When you are lying down alone you call up all those immortal stories of love and war in lofty rhyme, you call up our sweetest Shakespeare, fancy's child; even in your feverish dreams the poet's lays are warbled in your ears. Scenes and pictures that have come to you from your studies crowd into your mind, and these well repay your toil as you are getting old.

But far more important than that is that when you send forth armies into the field to cope with your enemies in the gate there should be no equipment wanting for your warriors—the equipment of the body, the equipment of the material, the equipment of the brain. I could go on for hours, but the war has taught you better than I can. I believe, having regard to our duties in this Imperial State and the need for high education, that the war was a blessing in disguise. An Irish bishop wrote eloquently at the very beginning of the late war about the elevation of manhood in war; and I, in ending this lecture, will finish with his words:

“As I note how nobly natures form
Beneath the war's red rain,
I deem it true, that He who made
The earthquake and the storm,
Perchance made battles too!”

APPENDIX I.

IGNORANCE OF THE YOUNG OFFICERS AT ALDERSHOT.

“Headquarters Office, Aldershot.

“*24th October, 1900.*”

“I would wish to draw attention to the fact that the writing and spelling of many of the junior officers (of Militia) is very indifferent. As many of these officers have joined the Militia with the view of obtaining commissions in the Regular Army, I hope that you will consider it worth while bringing this fact to the notice of the head masters of public schools, as, considering the amount the parents pay for their education, the result is not at all satisfactory.”

APPENDIX II.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR-GENERAL SIR COLERIDGE GROVE'S REPORT.

With regard to their professional subjects—and it must be remembered that these officers will go straight to the front in many cases—“an ignorance of the elements of Military Engineering, almost complete, is evident” on the part of the greater number of the candidates.

In Military History, as the examiner calls 130 pages of Hamley's “Operations of War,” with about 400 words to the page—a course that

any sergeant of Volunteers could learn by heart in three weeks—"a large number of officers have apparently not studied the text-book."

In Military Topography about nine candidates out of ten sent in unsatisfactory—"very weak"—papers.

One officer who passed got 168 marks out of 20,000; six cavalry officers between them got an aggregate of less than 15,000 marks out of 120,000, in every subject.

I have had opportunities of carefully watching the operations of so-called "crammers" for more than twenty years. They would have done much better work only that they were thwarted at every turn by the jealousy of schoolmasters and the folly of officials. But I venture to suggest that at their worst their pupils never were the subjects of a report such as that by Sir Coleridge Grove.

It might be, of course, that young gentlemen whose general and technical education was scandalously neglected would have developed splendid activity of body and lofty aspirations of soul, but this is not often the case.

In civilised countries the ignorant man is seldom distinguished for any fine qualities, and as a rule a young gentleman who knows nothing at the age of twenty-one is not fit to be entrusted with the lives of soldiers.

I have put it to many senior officers if the young officers who joined regiments or batteries in 1900 were in any respect superior to those who joined up to 1897. The answer has been a very decided negative.

APPENDIX III.

MILITARY EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

But what about Continental officers? The Franco-German War was won, as all French authorities now admit, by superior education and brain-power, and because skill and industry combined prepared victory in time of peace.

Are the Germans well educated now? Every son of the German leisured and professional classes must prove clearly that he has worked well at SCHOOL, or, if lazy at school, that he has worked well at a CRAMMER'S before he is twenty years of age, or he must become a private soldier. From this dilemma there is no escape. Besides, no German father of the middle class would tolerate the presence of a son who was a mere ignoramus at his table. No six German officers aged twenty, could possibly become celebrated by being unable to score 15,000 marks out of 120,000 at any easy examination in boyish learning. It is, therefore, very difficult to institute comparisons which will help us much.

The German course, which is obligatory on all officers, is twofold :—

1. Candidates from the Kadettenschulen are admitted into the *Selecta*, corresponding to Sandhurst and Woolwich, on passing the qualifying examination in the subjects and standards exacted in the *Prima*, corresponding to sixth forms in our schools. There is no Greek, and small weight is attached to Latin, the test being easy translations from Latin into German.

German is very important, and every cadet must be familiar with the masterpieces of the national literature. French is also important, and includes translation of French and German authors, essays, and fluent conversation.

To English much value is attached, and the course is similar in kind to the French course. It is very practical. Elementary physics and chemistry and arithmetic and geometry are also required. British cadets, as a rule, learn no history of any kind, and their geographical knowledge is very poor, but in Germany the courses in both these most important subjects are excellent, interesting and thorough. The elements of general history and ancient classical history are supplemented by a very exact knowledge of German history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with a particular knowledge of its military features, and of the economical and constitutional development of the Fatherland. Our authorities should at once insist on British history and literature taking as prominent a place in our programmes, whether the public-school masters like the idea or not.

2. The German Army gets its officers either from the Kadettenschulen direct or from private establishments, or "CRAMMERS," who are held in high esteem by parents and recognised by the State. There is no competition, but every candidate must pass a very trying qualifying examination and qualify in every subject—a very difficult process, which fills the private establishments to overflowing; for candidates are most eager to pass, and success implies special coaching, since few can pass unaided in the first trial. This was the case in England also—1874-1885—when the course was deteriorated to meet the views of five or six head masters, who would not take the trouble to comply with the wishes of the Government, but whose social influence was as unique as it was unmerited, and who were splendidly paid and housed while the real teachers were half-starved.

The German literary programme embraces the following curriculum :—

Latin : Easy translation.

German : German literature and an outline of foreign literature; essays, which must be good in matter and style; practice in declamations and discourses.

Mathematics: Severe tests for artillery, elementary for cavalry and infantry.

History: A very instructive and comprehensive course of general history and military geography; modern German history in detail.

Chemistry and Physics: A general elementary knowledge.

French and English: A thorough sound knowledge.

Thus German subalterns are men of culture, and fit to undertake the serious study of the art of war.

Without a sound system of general education no sound professional education for soldiers or any other men is possible.

APPENDIX IV.

COURSE FOR ST. CYR, IN FRANCE.

The poetry and brilliant prose compositions of past Frenchmen, as well as the records of the wanderings of the Crusaders and of the merchants and soldiers who gave to France, for a time, the command of North America and almost ousted our East India Company, and the campaigns of Condé, and Turenne, and Saxe, and Hoche, and Napoleon, in fact "all the glories of France," are impressed upon the mind of every young student, and in the school books "leading characteristics, and facts, and personages are presented in bold relief," while the accompanying illustrations, beautifully worked out, display to young minds natural greatness, endurance, self-sacrifice and glory as in a panorama.

Every candidate for St. Cyr must be between 17 and 21 years of age, and must possess the certificate of the first part of the baccalaureate, and also that of either secondary classical, or secondary modern instruction.

It is not to be supposed that the "Classical Side" excludes modern subjects, the "Secondary Modern," is, of course, more up-to-date, as it were; but even under the "Programme de l'enseignement secondaire classique," année scolaire 1896-1897, page 51, students of fifteen years of age are thoroughly well taught in French literature, as well as Latin; they learn books corresponding to our "Piers Ploughman" and "The Canterbury Tales," and they get extracts from, and lectures on, all the early writers, and in Corneille, Racine, Boileau, Bossuet, La Bruyère, and up to Victor Hugo.

No military student in England now learns English literature, and his conversation and written compositions are in consequence hopelessly stupid.

There follows a most excellent summary of Historical study on pages 57, 59, succeeded by a system of efficient instruction in Geography,

Mathematics, and Drawing. All this programme is for students of fifteen.

The old traditions of military French education are maintained. Every French candidate for St. Cyr must be very well educated before he can present himself for admission.

The candidates would regard the majority of young gentlemen who have recently been gazetted in this country from the Militia, and indeed those who were admitted into Sandhurst also, with envy not unmixed with amazement. There can be no doubt of the prowess of our young heroes, though the French officers are brave enough also. The physical and moral qualities of our cadets are at least as good.

If our Government only compelled our schoolmasters to teach a similar course to that set forth on pages 61-71 of the French programme to their pupils aged 17, there would be no complaint from any person in England, however fastidious, as to the general education of our junior officers. This course, be it observed, is practically obligatory on every member of the French upper and middle classes.

Having thus passed their preliminary examinations, the candidates for the Army are tested again amongst themselves, and the rules for 1901 are to this admirable effect.

Each candidate must pass in Gymnastics, Fencing, and Riding; physical loafers, therefore are excluded. These are capital tests, and, at least, as good training for officers as third-class cricket or football, in which games no examination of individuals is possible.

The literary course embraces Elementary Mathematics, History, and Geography; in all cases the test papers require clear knowledge within certain limits. In no case is it left to the power of capricious and fantastic pedants of examiners to render the whole programme a farce, as is too commonly the case here. The arrangements of the Examining Boards are excellent, but they are too lengthy to quote. An examiner does not get a chance of making a fool of himself and his victims. The use of Logarithms, Practical Geometry, and sketches of a landscape with buildings, follow. The written and oral examinations in German are practical, and a Candidate who can get good marks manifestly must know his German very well.

Candidates may also, if they please, be examined in other languages, as English, Arabic, Spanish, Italian, or Russian.¹

It is perfectly clear from all this that gentlemen like those who have recently been held up to public ridicule at Aldershot and by Sir Coleridge Grove in this country, though themselves blameless, cannot be found in

¹ The Programme has been published by Delalain Frères, 115, Boulevard St. Germain, Paris, and is well worthy of the attention of our authorities.

all France, and certainly every French officer has had a thoroughly good all-round mental training before the age of twenty.

In France it would be perfectly useless for parents to go round to authorities begging for direct commissions for their sons on whom they will not bestow the foundations of general knowledge.

In Russia the study of brilliant historical treatises is obligatory in all schools.

It is on the whole, then, very clear that in no part of Europe is it possible for a candidate to become an officer as long as he remains more ignorant than an ordinary clerk.

APPENDIX V.

MILITARY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Latin and Greek are excluded from the curriculum of United States officers, yet for their numbers they are excellent, and the Military Academy at West Point is one of the very best academies in the United States; in some respects it has never been surpassed.

In that country "Education," to quote a recent American ambassador, "is the leading industry." Instructors and professors are highly esteemed. Extreme poverty on the part of a student is no disgrace. Private tutors rank at least as high as Government officials. No pains are spared to secure very able instructors; the staff is large, and teaching is made a high art—a fine career, not a "loaf" for a few years. I suggest that the officers should study Major Boileau's essay on "The United States Military Academy at West Point"—*Proceedings Royal Artillery Institution*, No. 12, Vol. XIX., 1902.

Course of Studies.

The West Point course is severe and of a high standard. There are no voluntary subjects, and the obligatory ones must be mastered by every cadet. The following syllabus will speak for itself:—

Fourth Class, First Year.

Mathematics—Elementary Algebra and Trigonometry, Geometry, Analytical Geometry, and Surveying.
English Grammar, Rhetoric, and Composition.
Ethics and Universal History.
French.

Third Class, Second Year.

Mathematics—Analytical Geometry, Descriptive Geometry, Differential and Integral Calculus, and Method of Least Squares.
Drawing—Topography, Practical Surveying Geometry, Shades, Shadows and Perspective, and Isometric Projections.
French.

Second Class, Third Year.

Mathematics—Elements of Analytical Mechanics.

Physics—Sound and Light, Heat, Electricity, and Magnetism.

Other Sciences—Astronomy, Chemistry, Electric Physiology, Mineralogy, Petrography, and Elements of Geology.

Drawing—Freehand, Landscape in black and white, Constructive and Architectural.

Tactics—All Arms. The Service of Heavy Artillery.

First Class, Fourth Year.

Engineering—Civil and Military, Field and Permanent Fortification, Siege Operations, and Stereotomy.

The Elements of the Art of War.

Ordnance and Gunnery.

Spanish.

International, Constitutional, and Military Law.

Outlines of the World's History.

Historical Geography.

Practical — Astronomy, Surveying, Reconnaissance, Field Telegraphy, Ballistics, and Pyrotechnics.

There is no entrance examination except in the “three R’s” and in History and Geography—a very sound course.

Certain political reasons make competition, which is admitted to be desirable, a matter of suspicion.

Observe the value attached to English and French and History and Geography.

APPENDIX VI.

THE GERMAN EMPEROR'S VIEWS.

Since he became Emperor, this remarkably able sovereign's views on these matters have become more pronounced.

“In the study of history, knowledge must be imparted, more than has formerly been the case, in modern events and their effect on our own country. To this end, special stress will be laid on German history, particularly of the later and latest periods, while the ancient history, and that of the Middle Ages will be made use of rather as providing examples of heroism and historical greatness, and likewise as giving a general view of the changes and developments of our civilisation.

“The geographical instruction, both political and physical, must be made to exemplify and support the historical studies. Its further object is, that the student will know thoroughly all about the geography of his

own country and its peculiarities, and also understand and appreciate that of foreign countries.

"The study of German is the most important of the whole course of instruction. The scholar must be instructed in every step of his progress in the correct use of his mother tongue. Special consideration must be given to the choice, both in German language and literature lessons, of extracts for reading, lectures and essays, bearing on the traditions, civilisation, and classics of ancient times, and the subjects and writings referring to German traditions. The student will also be made acquainted with the literary development of the other important civilised nations by an introduction to certain of their literary masterpieces.

"In the study of modern languages the students will be encouraged and instructed from the very commencement in the practical use of the tongue.

"I desire that this Order be made known to the Army generally, and have commanded the War Office accordingly.

"Berlin, (Signed) WILHELM.

"13th February, 1890."

APPENDIX VII.

SANDHURST COURSE IN 1884.

Examination of Candidates for Admission by Open Competition for Sandhurst, 1884.

12. Candidates for admission by competition will be required to pass:—

1. A "Preliminary" Examination.
2. A "Further" Examination.

13. Preliminary examinations will be held in the spring and autumn of each year by the Civil Service Commissioners, to whom intending candidates should apply. No evidence of age or moral character will be required. No limit is placed on the number of trials allowed for the preliminary examination.

14. A candidate will be required at the preliminary examination to satisfy the Civil Service Commissioners in the following subjects, but no marks will be given:—

1. Mathematics—viz. (a), arithmetic, including vulgar and decimal fractions, proportion, and simple interest; (b), Euclid, Book I.; (c), Algebra, up to and including simple equations.

2. French, German, or some other modern language; the examination being limited to translation from the language, and grammatical questions.
3. Writing English correctly, and in a good legible hand, from dictation.
4. The elements of geometrical drawing; including the construction of scales, and the use of simple mathematical instruments.
5. Geography.

15. Candidates may be exempted from the Preliminary Examination in all subjects except geometrical drawing if they can produce a certificate of having passed any of the following, viz. :—

1. Any of the University Examinations mentioned in para. 2 (b).
2. Responsions at Oxford or the Oxford University Examination in lieu thereof.
3. The Matriculation Examination of the London University.
4. The first University Examination in Arts or in Engineering at the Royal University of Ireland.
5. Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, provided it embraces mathematics. If it does not include that subject, they will be required to undergo an examination therein.
6. The Examination for a Degree or the "Preliminary Examination" of the Victoria University, Manchester.

Candidates exempted in all subjects except geometrical drawing may defer their examination in this subject until the Further Examination. Failing therein, they will be disqualified, and the examination will count as one of the trials allowed under para. 7. Candidates claiming exemption under this paragraph will be required to submit to the Civil Service Commissioners the certificates on which they found their claim.

The subjects of the Further Examination, and the maximum number of marks obtainable for each subject, will be as follows :—

To the Summer Examination of the Year 1885, inclusive.

- | | Marks. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Mathematics — viz., algebra, up to and including quadratic equations; the theory and use of logarithms; Euclid, Books I. to IV. and VI.; plane trigonometry; and mensuration | 3,000. |

Marks.

2.	English Composition, tested by the power of writing an essay, letter, or <i>précis</i> ; English literature, limited to specified authors ¹ ; and English history, limited to certain fixed periods, ² the authors and periods being notified beforehand	-	-	-	-	3,000
3.	Latin	-	-	-	-	3,000
4.	Greek	-	-	-	-	2,000
5.	French; the examination to be partly colloquial	-	-	-	-	2,000
6.	German	„	„	„	„	2,000
7.	Experimental sciences, viz., (a) chemistry and heat; or (b) electricity and magnetism ³	-	-	-	-	2,000
8.	General and physical geography and geology	-	-	-	-	2,000
9.	Drawing, freehand	-	-	-	-	1,000
10.	„ geometrical	-	-	-	-	500

Of these ten subjects, Candidates will not be allowed to take up more than four nor less than two, exclusive of freehand drawing and geometrical drawing.

465 competitors presented themselves.

There is now no Preliminary Examination, and English literature is excluded from the course.

APPENDIX VIII.

DECLINE OF KNOWLEDGE.

In 1864 there were 152 candidates for 40 Woolwich vacancies, and the subjects from which a selection might be made were :—Mathematics, English Language and Grammar and Composition, History of England and of the British Empire, an excellent course of Geography, Latin and Greek, German, French, Hindustani, Experimental and Natural Sciences

¹ The authors specified for the December examination were as follows, viz. :—

<i>Chaucer</i> ...	Prologue to <i>Canterbury Tales</i> .
<i>Shakespeare</i> ...	<i>Merchant of Venice</i> .
	Henry VIII.
<i>Pope</i> ...	<i>Essay on Man</i> , <i>Satires</i> (with Prologue) and <i>Epistles</i> .
<i>Bacon</i> ...	<i>Essays</i> XXIII. to LVIII., inclusive.
<i>Macaulay's Essays</i> ...	Burleigh and his times.
	Life and Writings of Addison.
	Frederic the Great.

² The Examination in English History was limited, at the Candidate's choice, either to the period A.D. 1760 to 1790 (inclusive), or to the period A.D. 1790 to 1820 (inclusive), and it was announced that the Candidate's reading on the period selected should include that part of Bright's History which treats of it.

³ Subjects (a) and (b) are alternative; a Candidate will not be allowed to take up both.

and Drawing. The names of private tutors and "crammers" were published in the official report.

Since 1884 the Public Schools (so-called) have obliterated both the best subjects and the names of the ablest teachers.

In December, 1900, no fewer than 82 Sandhurst candidates were quite ignorant of English History or any other Modern History, and the knowledge of half of the 40 others was very trifling.

The names of the examiners, eminent men, were published with papers in 1864.

See the contemptible character of Science teaching in English Secondary Schools, *Times*, 21st January, 1901, set forth in speeches on these schools at a Masters' Conference.

Colonel LONSDALE HALE (late R.E.):—Gentlemen, you will be glad to hear that the War Office have appointed a Committee, consisting of the Adjutant-General, Sir Edward Ward of Ladysmith, General Clive, and myself, with an archdeacon, a rector, and a vicar who has given up his white tie to become a Member of Parliament, to enquire into the educational condition of the junior ranks of the clergy, especially the curates. We are to find out the causes why they cannot preach, why they do not know theology, why they are not good spiritual pastors and masters, and then we are to advise remedies. I am sure you will greet with applause the constitution of that Committee, and you will read with avidity what we shall report. The composition of the Committee to enquire into the condition of the young officers of the Army was just about as ridiculous as would be that of the imaginary Committee I have described to you—four civilians, who knew absolutely nothing about the British Army; a brother engineer, Major-General Jelf, who really could know little outside his own corps; Lieut.-Colonel Hammersley, a junior battalion commanding officer; and Captain Lee, an ex-Artillery officer, who has passed his service mainly on the other side of the Atlantic; it was this extraordinary Committee that was appointed to enquire into the "young life" of the British Army. My friend the lecturer has given me an opening for introducing this topic. Dr. Maguire has characterised this Report as true, honest, and laborious. I know the gravity of the assertion I am going to make, but I say, nevertheless, that the Report, as based on the evidence, is not true; the Report, as based on the evidence, is unreliable; the investigation as carried out was partial; it was unfair, and the document is worthless so far as the young officer is concerned. I have had a great difficulty in obtaining any chance of getting a hearing on this matter because, as the *Nineteenth Century* this month says, the Committee has produced a Report which has caused "a widespread interest, not to say sensation," throughout the country, and the whole of the editors of the country pretty well seem to have gone in for and backed up the Report. Thank goodness, we have the old Royal United Service Institution where we soldiers who know something about our profession can come and speak freely. I will proceed to deal with that part of the Report which treats of the young officer. I charge the Committee with not properly reporting important evidence; I charge them with having attributed to Sir Ian Hamilton opinions that he absolutely denied. At page 33 of the Report you will find these words:—"The Committee have been informed on very high authority that the majority of young officers will not work unless compelled, that 'keenness is out of fashion'; that 'it is not the correct form; the spirit and

fashion is rather not to show keenness,' and the 'idea is, to put it in a few words, to do as little as they possibly can.'" They say that they have been thus informed on "very high authority" with regard to the "majority" of the young officers, and in the reference that high authority is Sir Ian Hamilton. But Sir Ian Hamilton in his evidence denies that his words apply to more than a very few officers. I have here the words which Sir Ian used. Sir Ian did say something on the subject, but the Committee could not even correctly copy his remarks out of the evidence. He was speaking in this spirit with regard to some of the officers, and then comes question 695.—"In the whole of their service?" A.—"No, I do not say that." Q. 696.—"In the junior ranks?" Now listen to the answer, remembering that these seven gentlemen use the opinions of Sir Ian Hamilton as applied by him to the "majority" of junior officers:—"My remarks were meant to bear reference only to the most junior ranks; even then I speak very generally; there are many exceptions, of course." Gentlemen, what is the value of that Report? Do think of the gravity of this matter. Here Sir Ian Hamilton says "I did not mean the majority," and these seven gentlemen have put their signatures to the statement that he was speaking of the majority, and the false statement has gone through the whole length and breadth of the country. Is not that a serious matter? Is this Report a reliable document? Now let me go on to another point—the unfairness. The Committee went into the question of the inducements to professional study, and they sent to 87 commanding officers the question, "Do you consider that there are sufficient inducements to an officer to study his profession?" Of those 87, 54 replied that they did not think there were sufficient inducements, but 33 replied that there were sufficient inducements. However, the Committee determined that there was a lack of inducements, so they referred to it in this Report, and they refer us to the appendix to see what these 87 commanding officers said on the subject. I turn to that reference, and I find the heading "Selected Replies from Commanding Officers." Now a Report is usually based on evidence, and when you issue a Report you are bound to give the evidence on which a conclusion in the Report is come to. Naturally, when I turned to this reference and saw "Selected Replies from Commanding Officers," I expected to see selected replies both from officers who said there were not sufficient inducements, and from officers who said there were. I read the selected replies; there are 13, but they are all from commanding officers who take the same view as the Committee. Not one reply is given from the minority who were against the conclusion eventually adopted by the Committee. Do you suppose I am going to believe what they say about these replies when I do not see them, after their having misrepresented Sir Ian's words? I decline to believe what they say about those 33 officers whom they do not quote. Just listen how they treat those 33 officers who are in the minority. "A few replies in a contrary sense, asserting that there are inducements, have been received; but these are nearly all qualified by the statement that the inducements are sufficient for *keen* officers. What is required are inducements strong enough to make officers keen." They say "A few replies in a contrary sense." A few replies! The proportion is 11 to 18. Do you mean to say that if 54 men gave an opinion in one direction and 33 in the other you can say the 33 are only a few replies? In my opinion, it is a great many replies. Here we have a suppression of evidence, and nothing else. We were entitled to see the other side of the question as well as the Committee's side. Then, they cannot even prepare an index. I have waded through nearly all the evidence, and I turned to the index to see from the witnesses who gave oral evidence what they thought on the matter of inducements I found this heading "Inducements to officers to study their profession seriously, insufficient." That is what the Committee have determined—insufficient. One

reference attached to this heading has no bearing on the subject at all, and another may be construed both ways. I knew there were certain witnesses who said there were sufficient inducements, and therefore I looked for the heading "Inducements to officers to study their profession seriously, sufficient." There is no heading at all. Is that fair? Is that honest? There are in that evidence questions and answers saying that the inducements are sufficient, and the Committee have left out any reference to them in the index, so that if you go by the index alone to find out what was given in the evidence you will be absolutely misled. But what about these inducements? There were four civilian members on the Committee. I do not know what to say about the military men. Two of them are old personal friends of my own, but I think these two military members were mere cyphers—I really do, because I cannot see how they influenced the Committee in any way whatever. Surely when the question arose "Are there inducements enough or not?" if 33 men say there are sufficient inducements and 54 say there are not, you would naturally have said to the 33, "What are the inducements you find sufficient?" It would be only common sense to do that, if you wanted to probe the thing to the bottom. After you had ascertained the inducements that these 33 men thought were sufficient, you would refer them to the 54 who thought they were not sufficient, and say, "Why don't you find them sufficient?" Why did not they say to Colonel Mends, who said he found quite enough inducements to make his battalion of the King's Royal Rifles work, "What are the inducements which enable you to make your officers work?" And why did not they then say to General Lyttelton, another green jacket corps man, who said he had not found them sufficient in the Rifle Brigade, "Have you tried these inducements?" My friend the lecturer in the morning in his very witty evidence—it is most amusing to read it—told the Committee that there was a lack of inducements to work, and I told them in the afternoon that I thought the inducements were sufficient. Why on earth, if they understood the importance of the matter, did not they say to me: "Dr. Maguire this morning said there were not sufficient inducements; tell us, Colonel Hale, what the inducements are?" They did not go into the matter, they left it severely alone. It was a most important question, but there were on the Committee four civilians who knew nothing whatever about the matter. Then I go on to the next point. Do not we soldiers all know that very much in a regiment depends on the commanding officer? Gentlemen, we know perfectly well that if the company officers do not know their work, there is a great deal of responsibility for it resting on the senior officer. The Committee did not go into the question of the responsibility of the seniors; they seem to have thought the Army was something different from a school. Supposing my old school at Charterhouse had got into this terrible state, and the governing body determined to find out how it had all happened, and had said to the Headmaster of Eton, Dr. Warre, and to the Headmaster of St. Paul's, Mr. Walker, both of whom were on the Army Committee, "Go to Charterhouse and find out how this rotten state of things exists." Do you mean to say that Dr. Warre and Mr. Walker would have "gone for" the young boys only? Do not you think they would have found out how the instruction was given? Would not they have gone to the headmaster and said that the teaching staff was wrong? It seems it never occurred to Dr. Warre or Mr. Walker to adopt a similar line here. Is it not the same with the crammers? When they find that their classes are going wrong, do they not go to the instructors and find out if they are to blame for it? It is the seniors who are responsible, and yet the seniors are left alone—absolutely alone. Now I have to make a grave charge against the Committee. Three gentlemen, Dr. Maguire, Lieut.-Colonel Moores, and a gentleman of the name of Philpotts, the Headmaster of Bedford Grammar

School, have put forward secondhand hearsay evidence reflecting in the highest degree on the senior officers of the Army. Dr. Maguire told them what he said hundreds of officers had told him. Lieut.-Colonel Moores told them what at least fifty officers has told him—how the senior officers of the Army discourage the study of their profession among the junior officers of the Army. These three gentlemen have been allowed to send in long memoranda into which this subject enters, and which are printed and published in this book. Mr. Philpotts of Bedford I might almost leave alone, for whilst he tells us about the life and about the doings of the Army, he unfortunately went a little bit beyond this, and told us old teachers how we ought to teach military history and employ concrete instances; and he informs us that the battle of Gravelotte is a battle that we should select as an instance of brilliant charges of cavalry, and he tells us what happened at Sedan. You, Sir, and I, went over that ground together, and if Mr. Philpotts can prove one of his three principal incidents of Gravelotte and Sedan to be a fact, I will give £5 to any Bedford charity that exists. They are all fiction, and so may be his knowledge of young life in the Army. I will now take Lieut.-Colonel Moores's statement. According to this statement, officers have come to Colonel Moores and have said, "I have forgotten all I knew on joining, no person has ever encouraged me to keep up my knowledge of the subjects; and, in fact, if I were to read or to talk about reconnaissance or field works, or strategy, or military history, the senior officers would be displeased with me." Think what that means—that if a captain or a subaltern in an infantry battalion is found reading that splendid book "*Caldwell's Minor Expeditions*," the senior officers would be displeased with him. These four civilians did not understand it; but what were the three military officers about? Could a graver charge be made against the senior officers of the Army than that—that if they knew their officers were reading tactics they would be displeased with them? I am not finding fault with Colonel Moores for having made this secondhand statement. I am not finding fault with my friend Dr. Maguire for having made similar statements, but I say, What ought the Committee to have done? They did not realise the gravity of the statement. Ought not they to have asked the Commander-in-Chief, the Adjutant-General, the commanding officers, whether this state of things existed? If it did exist, it was at the bottom of everyone of our disasters in South Africa. But they did not ask anyone anything about it, they did not even cross-examine on it. They have left it alone, and I say that their doing so is a scandal—it is a scandal, on the part of that Committee, that they have allowed all these charges against the senior officers to remain in the appendices and to be published without any investigation or enquiry into their truth. Should not they at all events have said to Dr. Maguire, Colonel Moores, and to Mr. Philpotts, "Unless you can prove it, we must strike it out of the evidence and appendix"? No, they have not done so. If the Committee had been determined to damn the British officer, they could not have done better. They have allowed this disgraceful charge with regard to the senior officers of the Army to remain and to be published in the Report—to be read by the staff of every Army in Europe, and to be held up to ridicule throughout the entire Continent. It is a disgrace and a scandal. Now, about the remedies proposed by this Committee. There is an amusing side to that Committee. I cannot make out who the comic man was on it, but there was somebody. They proposed a universal military history examination. Every year the unfortunate officer until he becomes a lieutenant-colonel—perhaps twenty-five years—is to be subjected to an examination in one particular campaign of military history, notified in Army Orders at the beginning of each year, much as is done in the entrance examination for the Staff College. I am told that there will be 10,000 candidates in military history. Where is your army of examiners to

come from? Is it not an odd thing to start an examination for 10,000, and not to ask the people who came before the Committee how it was to be worked out? There were four witnesses before the Committee who I venture to say know more about military history examinations than any men in the country—Dr. Maguire, Major James, Colonel Henderson, and my humble self. This idea of a military history examination does not appear in the evidence at all; you cannot find it in the evidence. It has come out of the inner consciousness of the seven gentlemen on the Committee. They did not ask Dr. Maguire or any of the others I named how this 10,000 papers examination would work or could be carried out. What would be the result? In the first place, the officers would have to read one campaign, and they will not read anything but that campaign. They will say, "With that blooming old examination in front of us we will limit our work entirely to that." The lecturer and I cross swords here, but we do not cross swords outside. There will be a syndicate formed as soon as the campaign is published, and an annual series of military histories will be published bearing the monogram H.M.G., and we shall publish a history of the campaign during each year; it will contain also a series of papers, honours and pass, with a key to the answers charged for as an extra. We shall issue this, and then Dr. Maguire will take an extra three or four houses in Earl's Court, I will take a street in Aldershot, and Major James will go and take two or three villages at Salisbury; we will have our places elsewhere, and we shall have a good time of it. Nobody will ever study military history, they will "cram" it, our classes will be full, they will all pass, and we shall enjoy all the money benefit. That is one of this marvellous educational Committee's ways of putting things straight in the Army. But this Report has its very serious side, for it will be the way in which people who are not in the Army look at the Army; for they will not trouble to look at the evidence, they will accept the Report on the faith of the signatures to it. I repeat, however, that it is, as regards the officers of the Army, in many respects untrue, and unreliable, that the investigation has been badly conducted, and the work is little short of worthless.¹

Colonel F. J. GRAVES (late 20th Hussars):—It fell to my lot to read a paper here when General Clive was in the Chair, as on this occasion, as far back as 1892, on this very subject. I divided it into two sections: "Education for the Army," and "Education in the Army." A few days after the discussion here there were a number of leading articles upon the subject, and as I was leaving the War Office one day I met one of the Civil Service Commissioners, who had been an examiner at Somerset House for something like 27 years, and he referred to one of those leading articles which remarked upon this paper, and said he was sorry he had not been able to attend, as he could have got up and stated dogmatically that, after his lengthened experience as a public examiner for a great number of professions, he had come to the conclusion that the average education of the ordinary public-school boy of that time did not come up to that of a third-class female telegraph clerk. That is pretty hot. I believe things have greatly improved since that time. The headmasters, who shortly after the date I refer to met in conference, came to the conclusion that a general education is not the

¹ I desire to say that the charges I have made here against the Committee are directed against them in their corporate capacity only, and that only. On it were three of my own valued friends, not one of whom I could not trust implicitly in private life. I have elsewhere characterised this Committee as a "Misguided War Office Committee," and so I believe it to have been. My impression is that it was guided from without and not from within.—L. H.

summum bonum that every young man ought to start in life with ; that education—the leading out and developing and stirring up of the mind judiciously—should be conducted upon the lines that the boy's future life would run upon ; that to a certain limited extent specialism should be introduced into public-school life with the view to the boy's education at school having a distinct reference to the line of life he is going to follow. The learned Doctor this afternoon has given us the general principles which have filled his mind, and there is no one more capable than Dr. Maguire to do so. If he had had time he would, no doubt, have dealt with the practical difficulties. He says that the education of their children is the first duty of parents, and that leads me to ask the question, If it be true that the average education of an ordinary public-school boy is, or was, as described by that Civil Service examiner, upon whom does the blame rest ? When I read this paper I said some pretty strong things about the public schools in those days ; but since then I am rather inclined to believe that, if anything, it is almost as much the fault of the parents themselves. I do not believe that the general run of parents think sufficiently and with sufficient judgment of the early education of their children. I am perfectly sure that one of the great reasons why our public schools have so lamentably failed in supplying qualified men for the Army, and why their failure has raised up consequently a great body of intelligent men, such as Dr. Maguire and my friend Colonel Lonsdale Hale, and others, who are improperly called "crammers"—I call them Army tutors—is that very failure of our public schools. I believe the majority of our youth go to the public school improperly and insufficiently grounded, and the public-school master has to make the best of a bad bargain. The boy who wants to go into the Service is hurriedly trained, more or less crammed, to answer questions, to get marks, with the result that there are many failures. The boys' parents, finding they are not getting on, take them away and send them to a crammer as a sort of last resort of the destitute, so that the boy may in some way be shored into the Army. To prove that this is so, I will just take the words of Dr. Warre himself in an interview with a writer in one of our magazines. He said, "In my schooldays the curriculum practically resolved itself into Latin and Greek, for we were taught little mathematics and no French." I go a step further ; not only are the bulk of our children improperly and insufficiently grounded before they go to school, but I would say, with great diffidence, and in no unkind spirit, that if the bulk of our headmasters and assistants at the public schools were educated on the lines Dr. Warre applies to himself, then they were not sufficiently educated to pass boys into the Army. They were educated in a very one-sided and improper manner. Classics, no mathematics, and little French, is not the education a man ought to have who is to be any other than a blind leader of the blind. I believe that though some of our public-school masters may have a sufficient education to be raised, as the Doctor said just now, to the bench of Bishops, that kind of education is no good for passing young men out into the world to earn their living. Dr. Warre goes on to say that boys were put on their metal three times every year. I do not think that was nearly sufficient. I remember that when I was at school, once a month we were put through a regular Somerset House examination, marked just as we should have been there, shown our papers, and made to do our corrections ourselves. The result was that those who went from that school had been trained in passing examinations. I did not care one straw about the paper that was put before me when I went up for my examination, because I had been examined in every subject I was taught once a month. Again, our headmaster believed in individualism, and we who were to go in for any special line went two and two after school hours to some of his best men, paying extra for it. Here is another point which is very useful to men who

instruct the young. The instructors had made a close study of the idiosyncrasies of the public examiners, and one of those men came to London with us. We put up at a little hotel in Adam Street, and that man the night before the examination said, "Now, So-and-so is going to examine you to-morrow, and he will very likely give you such and such a problem." That is a hint to public-school masters and others conducting education. In conclusion, I would say above all things that the great point for the future of the boy is thorough grounding in his early years. Will you bear with me kindly for two minutes while I give you an example from my own personal experience? Close by me lives the widow of an officer, and she has one daughter who has a marvellous gift of imparting instruction. She takes five or six little boys at a very early age and grounds them thoroughly in a certain number of subjects, and passes them on to a well-known and successful preparatory school in the same place. The schoolmaster told me that the boys who came from that lady's house were the best-grounded boys he had in his school. The mother of one of those boys, who has only gone to school within the last month, told me that although he was only ten years of age he is not to be puzzled by any French verb, that he is thoroughly well grounded in Latin, and that he has a very fair knowledge of mathematics up to a certain point. That is what we want systematised in our country, the thorough grounding of the young from their earliest youth. I can venture to prophesy that that boy gives his master no trouble, and I hope that when he goes to a public school he will be found not to have a mere superficial smattering of five or six subjects which will be of no use to him in his after life. With regard to the Report which has been so hammered by my friend and old instructor, Colonel Hale, I would like to emphasise one point in particular with which I totally disagree in the Report. It is suggested that after a student enters the Military College or Military Academy, foreign languages should be dropped altogether. That is a most retrograde step. A boy getting into one of these colleges at 17 years of age, only imperfectly taught in a foreign language, if he dropped it for 18 months or two years he might as well never have learned a line of French or German at all. Lastly, I hope in time, owing to the great number of young officers who have got into the Service, and are now commissioned without any special education for their profession, that the Government, or the authorities, will see the advisability to restore, what I found very useful in days gone by, the old-fashioned garrison course under careful instruction. A four to six months' course for those officers before they are promoted I am sure would be of the greatest advantage to them and to the Service to which they belong.

Major-General J. H. DUNNE, Colonel of the Duke of Edinburgh's (Wiltshire Regiment):—The few words that I wish to speak as a father, as an uncle, and as a relation of a vast number of boys who have gone to Eton, Harrow, Wellington, and many other colleges, I must say now, or not at all. The last speaker endeavours almost entirely to throw the blame of the education of the boys who go to all these public schools on the unfortunate parents, who spend the best part of their lives, from the time those boys are about 5 or 6 years old, in picking out the best nursery governesses and the best schools. When I was a boy £50 or £60 a year was considered an ample sum for a small boy's education, but to-day those boys who go to the public schools cost us from £100 to £200 per annum to be prepared for those schools. Nearly all the fathers in England take all possible pains that their boys shall be grounded as well as possible. I have never before heard a complaint from the head masters in the public schools (who have a qualifying examination before the boys enter) that because they were not properly grounded on arriving at the public schools it was

the fault of the parents. I think, in the admirable speeches we have heard, we have wandered considerably from what Dr. Maguire came here to hold forth, which was the military education of the future. At the end of his lecture he gave a hit at what I agree with him is a ridiculous story—that story of the Duke of Wellington and the playing fields of Eton. I think there is much to be said against the inordinate amount of time devoted to physical games and sports, and the waste of time between the ages of 16½ and 18½ when boys are kept on at public schools playing cricket and hockey, and every other game under the sun. It might be well discussed by all of us here as to whether that should not be partially done away with. I think that the officers go into the Army now at too late an age. They had better be in the Army, as I was, at 16 years and 4 months, than remain until they are 18½, kicking their heels about at some great public school. Admirable as were my old friend Colonel Lonsdale Hale's witty and pungent remarks, I do not think they have anything to do with the main discussion as to what is to be the education of our future officers.

MR. H. F. WYATT :—I feel that I am very ill-fitted to follow such great experts as those whom we have heard speak to-day, and there is only one aspect of Dr. Maguire's remarks on which I think I may venture to comment, viz., that which had regard to the undue prevalence of a passion for games throughout this country in our great public schools, and I presume he meant in the Army also. At any rate, if the Army be free from that imputation, it is singularly distinct from the national life, for it is a matter of common knowledge that the cry of the British public for football and cricket news was never greater than it is to-day. The thing has reached so great a pitch that it affects the appointments of men and their progress in life. For instance, our schools practically give scholarships for excellence in games. In the universities it is a greater distinction very often to obtain a "blue" than to have obtained a first class in the schools. Men who have succeeded in distinguishing themselves in sports usually get masterships in public schools as a result, and these men are generally utterly unfitted to really educate the boys in any subject except that in which they themselves excel. They are consequently given, as a rule, the lowest forms. Now there is no time in life in which character is more formed than in very early youth. It was a Jesuit who said : "Give me the education of the boy until he is six years old, and I care not who has it afterwards." That is a paradox ; but still it remains that in early boyhood you can shape the character. There are no forms in a public school more important than the lower forms, and the lower forms to-day you would find very largely mastered by men with no other qualification than their skill in cricket or some other game. That condition of things inspires a boy at a critical period in life with the belief that the greatest thing he has to do is to distinguish himself in games, and that attitude of mind continues all through life. I take it that Dr. Maguire did not animadvert on games as games, but on the undue love of games. I do not think any reasonable man can deny that that excess exists throughout the English-speaking world. It must be a strange thing for an intelligent foreigner coming over here to learn the secrets of British trade to see on the placards in the street such items as "Jones no-balled again," or, as I remember seeing on a placard a few years ago, "Roberts in great form." It was the famous billiard player, not the great general, who was referred to. In our national life we attribute almost as much importance to success in games as to success in serious matters. A man like Dr. Grace is loved and admired by millions of people, and yet, without decrying his merit for a moment, it is not for an instant to be compared with the merit of the humblest British private soldier who, on the frontiers of the Empire, at the risk, or it may be at the actual cost, of his life, maintains the honour of his race.

Therefore, we want to eliminate from the Army and other departments of our life that undue love of games, that tendency to attribute excessive importance to them, which, far from making us a masculine people, tends to make us a people of an opposite kind, I will not trespass further upon the patience of the audience, except to say how much I, in common with everyone here, acknowledge the great debt which we owe to Dr. Maguire for his paper.

Colonel W. HUGHES HALLETT (late Indian Staff Corps) :—I think that boys and young men will not be at the trouble to acquire a sound general education—which is a necessary basis for special education—till there is a change in the tone of society. So long as conversation is confined to frivolities, and the introduction of serious subjects resented, so long will the youth of the classes under consideration remain ignorant of even the history and literature of their own country. The prevailing ideals of the day are in these respects contemptible, notwithstanding that books, magazines, and lectures are within reach of everyone.

Major-General WEBBER, C.B. (late R.E.) :—I have to differ from General Dunne as to the meeting having wandered from the subject. If you look at the epitome which has been placed in our hands you will see that Dr. Maguire began by referring to the Report of the "Committee on Education and Training of Officers," and, considering that that Report is the one thing which is stirring not only the minds of those who understand the subject a little but the minds of those who do not understand it, and considering that the heading of our lecture is "On Military Education," I do not think we can be said to have wandered nearly as much this afternoon as is generally the case, or often the case, in this Institution. This time last year I was informed by one of the distinguished gentlemen who was then going on to that Committee that he had been appointed, and I said to him, "Have you ever realised how you are going to approach the subject of military education?" And here I should like to say I am not speaking of the preliminary education, but technical education, which I think is the most important. "Will it be from the same point of view as you approached it as a professor when you were teaching the young men under you? Did not you know that, when you lectured and taught, the results of your work would be soon apparent in the success or failure of the lives of those young men? Was not the day's work of the world the field for the application of your teaching, and that criticism and experience would be brought home to you and tell you whether you had taught rightly or not? Do you realise that these young men who are being taught and educated technically for warfare are being taught for an object that may never arrive in their whole lives, for that one day, as Lord Napier of Magdala once said in this room, which every soldier longs for, and which it may never be his happiness to see? Do you realise that if you approach this subject of military education that must be the fundamental idea underlying all your enquiries and all your reports?" After the Report came out I met him in the street just outside this, and he said to me, "What do you think of our Report?" I said very much what Colonel Hale has said, and replied by asking him: "If there was going to be an enquiry into the teaching of young physicists, young doctors, or even young clergymen, would you put me upon the commission?" He said, "I understand; you do not believe we were fit to go into the question." And I had to admit that but few of them were so. I added, "You never seem to have approached that subject from the true point of view. I have examined the evidence, and the Report, and I can hardly find one question which shows you realised that the teaching of the soldier is to fit him for that great day in which his teaching must be used, and the only occasion, in fact, when you can

put to the test what he has learned." I think that is the question which not only the Committee failed to understand or approach, but those who had appointed it utterly failed to understand. When I heard my dear friend speaking just now in his most interesting lecture, a lecture which I believe you could hear within no other walls than these, I could not help—and I hope he will not mind me saying so—something coming over my heart and mind similar to that which I felt when nearly three years ago I read a book called "An Absent-minded War." I believe anyone who read that book with understanding considered, it a misrepresentation of everything, including the military administration of our Army. The man who wrote that book took hold of every little failing, and every little peace-time mistake, and built them up into an indictment against what—the British Army? I only just heard before I came into the room who that man was. When I read the book I should like to have challenged him to some sort of combat for the utter unfairness of the insinuations with which his book had been filled. I do not want to say that anything Dr. Maguire has told us to-day resembles that—I am quite sure it does not. He would be the last man to bring such wholesale indictment against the great body he from one point of view knows probably as well as anyone. I only say that a feeling came into my mind when he spoke about the Report, the same feeling that came over my mind when I read that wretched book. I was sad when I was also told to-day that the selection for the secretaryship, of that Committee—a most important one—was that very officer. If the education of the Army in the future is to be governed by that sort of Report, all I can say is "God help the officers in the British Army." The only question I wish to deal with further is that of "games." My views of games has been always that the instinct for games, the instinct for two sides in any contest, is that which has taught not only the officers but the rank and file of the Army the meaning of that great word *fair play*. It is the absence of the meaning of that great word and the frequent misunderstanding of it in other nations that gives us some superiority in one direction. Our officers and men instinctively coming out of the "playing fields" go into battle, knowing what it is "to play the game." The training by games is not to be despised, but it may be carried to excess. With regard to the list of old officers read to us by the lecturer, I knew two of them personally who were very fond of games. Therefore, I cannot endorse what he implied, namely, that the greatest men who rose to the head of affairs and became the greatest military leaders were men who had not cared for games and had never played them.

Major-General A. B. TULLOCH, C.B., C.M.G.:—The Public Schools Enquiry Commission of a generation ago showed very plainly that what Dr. Maguire states now was certainly the case then. It may be said great changes for the better have taken place in having entrance examinations and superannuation; but, judging by results, these changes are of little value. One drawback has been added which did not exist in former days, to its present extent, viz., the so-called athletics, apparently based on the false statement that the Duke of Wellington said the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. A housemaster at one of our great public schools informed me only the other day that athletics had so taken possession of the boys, that they do not now know what work really means. Easy and luxurious living has sensibly increased at many public schools, and unfortunately also school bills. If I may say so, the country is suffering from too much wealth. Too many boys are born with silver spoons in their mouths, whose fathers are indifferent to their school progress; they, so to say, set the pace, and if the parents of boys who have to make a living for themselves object, they are politely informed that they can find other schools which

would suit them better. With the school lists filled for years in advance, it requires a pretty strong conscience on the part of a master to bring down the style to the humble working bees, or rather those boys who should be the working bees. I may mention that even in that excellent movement, the cadet system, boys in one of the largest public schools have to pay £5 for their uniform. In Australia where I had, in Victoria alone, ten battalions of cadets each 500 strong, the total cost of a very smart khaki uniform was but £1. Dr. Maguire has so trenchantly dealt with public-school education, or rather the want of it, that I will not venture to say more on the subject, my own ideas being very decidedly given in a lecture delivered here, March, 1897 (*The Education and Training of Naval and Military Cadets*). I regret that, being abroad last year, I was unable to give evidence before the Education Committee. All I can say is, that if the Report of that Committee is properly carried out, it will be very greatly to the advantage of the Army and nation. There is one statement of the Report I must beg to differ from, viz., "That the majority of young officers will not work unless compelled, that keenness is out of fashion, that it is not the correct form, etc." Now, I venture to say that few have had more to do in the instruction and training for battle of young officers, or watched more carefully the training of officers of Continental Armies, than I have; and I have no hesitation whatever in stating that if an instructor or a colonel puts his back into his work he will have no more enthusiastic pupils, or better material to work upon, than the young officers of the British Army. On this subject I must beg to refer to a lecture I gave here as long ago as 1874 (*On the Education and Training of Officers*). This was after three years' work as garrison instructor. The only drawback I found, was the often appallingly defective school education of the officers, many of whom had never been taught to use their brains, or think for themselves. In my lecture on *Battle Training for Officers*, given here in 1897, I stated what my system had been as colonel of a regiment, and as brigadier-general, and how keen officers were to be taught their trade when they had a chance of learning it; but this they too rarely get. That officers soon sicken of tramping round a barrack square, and see the folly of never getting beyond the grammar of their profession, is only natural; but give them the proper opportunities outside the barrack railings of learning their work, and then I say clearly and distinctly that no officers in the world are more anxious for instruction than those of our Army, and this without expectation of any special promotion or reward, but simply because it is their duty to be ready for the day of battle. As for our autumn manœuvres, they may be of some use to heads of departments, but to all the rest—as so many of our young officers who have learnt war in South Africa, tersely say—autumn manœuvres as hitherto conducted were a grand system of teaching us "how not to do it." I would venture to suggest that instead of army corps contending against each other, divisions at war strength with a proper complement of artillery and cavalry would, in a close country like England, be quite large enough for instructional purposes. Mess tents, dry canteens, wagon loads of beer, goody-goody shops, and such-like should be rigidly prohibited; everyone should live as if on active service.

Dr. MILLER MAGUIRE, in reply, said:—I drew up an analysis of a lecture, and there is not the slightest doubt, as General Webber says, that the Report of the Committee was in my mind. But I drew it up on *Military Education in England* from a National and an Imperial point of view, not from a merely technical, military point of view. It was drawn up from the point of view of the effect of the general secondary education of the people on the Army and of its results throughout the Army on the Empire, if it turned out that the general as well as technical education of the

officers was not what it might reasonably be expected to be ; and what, if our upper classes could spend a little less time in luxury and games, and a little more time in considering the interests of their people for the future, it might easily be, and would be, much to the benefit of the nation at large. Accordingly, I had to deal with several points which have been ignored by my critics. I never approve of a lecturer taking up all the time at the disposal of his audience, especially when there is going to be a discussion, and I therefore indicated rather than discussed a large number of matters, hoping some one would discuss them, although I had not time to dwell upon them. Some of my points I will just repeat. I say that the cult of games, whether that cult of games was the cult of chariot racing in the declining Eastern Roman Empire, when the Greeks allowed the Turks to accumulate on the other side of the Bosphorus while they were betting about green and blue chariots ; or whether it be the mere gambling characteristics of some races in the East, Chinese or Barmese ; or whether crowds of people are furiously excited about horses and neglect all other interests, their families and everything else, by betting on animals that they could not ride ; or whether it is people crowded to hurrah a few men or boys playing cricket at Lord's, I point out that the same fashionable or vulgar folk, or so-called upper classes, would not go to see, or subscribe 1s. to see, such a magnificent patriotic show as Colonel Duke and others had the other day in the Albert Hall. People will go to glorify the players of games who will not go to see the development of athleticism and the self-denial and the physical culture of those of the community who come up at great expense to the Albert Hall to show how to do good to all future generations by cultivating their physique. I say that this kind of cult, excitement about football and other games, by fellows who cannot play any game, betting on horses by fellows who cannot ride horses—not one in five of the young gentlemen who enter Sandhurst could sit a horse or know anything about horses—I say that this kind of cult of games is a thing to be condemned, and is fatal to the proper mental and moral training of our race. I like sports, and so did many leading officers, including Edwardes. He won the admiration of the Bhils as a sportsman, and they followed him because of his prowess. But the kind of stuff and nonsense that is called sports and games, so far from being an elevation to the community, is a degradation of the community, and it is against that that I came here largely to speak. I say that the faults of our system are not due to the boys or officers, but due, as one officer who spoke said, to girls as well as boys ; but it is due very largely, and here is another point I put down, to the fact that mothers of the old-fashioned type are very badly wanted in England at the present time. My lecture, therefore, was a discourse on the consequences of the general features of the education of the nation, whether at home, or in the playing field, or in the school ; the habits of the nation, the tastes of the nation, the ambitions of the nation as affecting the instruction of the officers, the leading fighting men of the nation, and on whom alone the nation must depend in any crisis of its fate. I wanted also to say that it is madness to cultivate the body only to the neglect of the mind. I am daily mixing with people connected with the Army, and I know there is the greatest possible trouble in persuading parents that in addition to being a fine cricketer a boy should be well educated generally. I like a man to try to be a good cricketer if he is going to play cricket at all. If I was going to jump my horse I should like him to jump higher than my rival's horse, and in bowling I wished to put the other fellow at the wicket in danger of his life. In football, when as in my youth kicking and hurting were part of the game, I was bound to hurt my opponents' shins as much as I possibly could. Of course boys must play. But when you become a man you ought to put away childish things. A boy's parents ought to train him first with a honest, plain, simple,

straightforward education, physical, mental, and moral, and then impregnate him with the idea that he is going into a profession and ought to do the best he can for the profession, qualify himself by every possible means for success in his profession—impress upon him that this is his first duty to himself and to the State, and that it is a duty resting more upon the soldier man than on any other man. That was my doctrine. For the rest, I am very glad indeed that I was not one of the seven men to whom Colonel Lonsdale Hale refers, and who were appointed to enquire into the matter. At the Educational Committee, like some 73 other dutiful citizens, soldiers and civilians, merely under the terror of the Clock Tower, I answered precisely the questions put to me, and having been supplied with very many questions by some of the Commissioners, two of them masters in the leading schools of England, who sat to enquire about general education, not technical education alone, I answered the questions. It must be remembered that the reference was to the general education of gentlemen who wished to become officers.

Colonel LONSDALE HALE :—They went afterwards into the other matter.

Dr. MILLER MAGUIRE :—They were told to do so by the Government. If Colonel Hale is abusing the present vicious Government system, the present contemptible party Government in England as applied to war, all I can say is that I despise it beyond all power of expression. I would say, as the German Emperor said about the present system of teaching Greek, "Away with it!" If that is what Colonel Hale means, well and good; but I thought he was abusing the Committee, not the party Government of England. If you were abusing the Cabinet and War Office, what on earth could the Committee do, or could I do, against such incompetence? The Government is composed mainly of persons who in another walk of life would be nothing at all, merely inefficient folk, blind leaders of the blind, composed of persons who declare that they follow the man in the street, of people who had all this evidence that fills the library about the Army before them which they could have read themselves, as well as the Committee, and which it was their duty to read for themselves. They ought to have learned something before they took their posts. I would not take the post of the captain of the Royal yacht to-morrow, because I should wreck the yacht and drown myself; but the Secretary of War takes such an important post though he knows nothing about war. Colonel Lonsdale Hale then goes on to censure people like us who did their duty, and always did their duty, and learned their business carefully. The Committee was composed of four civilians.

Colonel LONSDALE HALE :—There were four honest citizens and three military men.

Dr. MILLER MAGUIRE :—In other words, there were seven worthy men appointed to examine into this matter: (a) the general education of the British officer, before he becomes a British officer; and (b) the education of the British officer afterwards. Is it not perfectly fair and proper to appoint general experts on general education to deal with the education of the man before he becomes an officer? Was there anything very preposterous in that? I am not here to defend Dr. Warre, or Mr. Walker, or Captain Lee, or Sir W. Forster, or any members in question at all, but they merely reported to the best of their ability as experts in general education. As far as I am concerned, I was referring more to the Report about education in general, and I stick to my original idea. Technical education would be matter enough for another lecture. In conclusion, I thank you most heartily for your kindness in listening to a mere civilian like myself so patiently, in a discourse of a very general and diffuse character, as the subject is of far-reaching importance.

The CHAIRMAN (General E. H. Clive) :—It is time to close the discussion, and I shall delay you but a very few minutes. I think the discussion has been ably conducted, and has travelled over a great deal of ground. Dr. Maguire very properly aims at perfection, which everybody would really like to see; that is to say, no matter how well we choose the material for going into the Army, he would like to see the intellectual qualifications of officers as good as their physical qualifications. Last year I was present at the annual Staff College dinner, when Lord Roberts was in the Chair. Lord Roberts made a speech, and as far as I recollect he enumerated the qualifications of a good staff officer. Lord Roberts said he must be a good rider, have a fine eye for country, be sound in health, untiring, keen-sighted, with great professional ability, good judgment, rapid decision, and of a determined character. But where are you going to find such a man? That kind of man is not to be found every day. The point which I believe we all agree upon is that we should provide the best material we can for the officers of the Army and train it properly by giving a more serious tone to the officer's mind. I have been connected with military education myself. I was Commandant of the Staff College in 1886-88, and I had a good opportunity of watching the careers of officers who passed out when they obtained employment in this big war fifteen years later. I can only say, as far as I was able to judge, that the nature of a man who is fond of competing, whether at cricket, football, riding a steeple-chase, or point-to-point races, will compete in active service in the field as well as at home. It is the instinct of competition that is in him, and I think it will be found, when the detailed history of the war is published, and the services of individual officers, whether staff or regimental, come under the judgment of the public for praise or blame, that, as a rule, those officers who have been endowed with the instinct of competition will be those who have rendered most valuable services to their country. But you will recollect that the lecturer is still dissatisfied with the training of our officers before and after they get their commissions, and demands more intellectual and more professional training. Well, of course, more study will be good for officers. The Army is like every other profession—success must be won in peace-time by study, in war-time by deeds. But, nevertheless, we need not be so despondent as Dr. Maguire; for if your system is so bad, how comes it that the great Empire which you see on this map has been built up, and is regularly administered in peace and quiet year by year? The material is, after all, the same. The youth of these islands provides the material for the Army and for the Colonial Service—and you know the result. I agree with the lecturer that we require officers to have more initiative and more responsibility in peace-time to enable the authorities to select the proper officers for advancement, and the result will be shown in the leading of troops in war-time. I am sure that you will agree with me that Dr. Miller Maguire has brought his views forward with the object of improving our officers, and for the good of the Army, especially on active service, and that you will join with me in giving him a unanimous vote of thanks for his most interesting lecture.