

Here is a commentary on the present posture of affairs. Lord Kitchener, in India, demands, what every capable soldier and every serious student of war and policy has always demanded, the right of the Commander-in-Chief to the supreme executive power. Lord Curzon objects. But Mr. Brodrick, whilome Secretary of State for War, admits the justice of Lord Kitchener's demand—which, after all, is pathetically modest; for a great soldier and administrator is only asking to be allowed to do his work properly. And at the same time, Mr. Arnold Forster at home is attempting to administer the Army without a Commander-in-Chief at all, and under the powers of an Order in Council which secures to him absolute autocracy over his professional advisers on the Board, which is called the Army Council. Here are two members of the same Cabinet acting on precisely opposite principles with regard to the same matter; yet a vote of censure directed at either would involve the fall of the Government.

As an instructive commentary on the whole matter, we have Mr. Balfour announcing that an invasion of these islands is impossible. I make no comment on that extraordinary assertion, other than to observe that, as it directly contradicts almost the whole body of expressed professional opinion, it furnishes a remarkable instance of extreme and ultimate irresponsibility.

The principle, in fact, of which we have been in search, the principle the understanding of which should serve to guide us towards a right working comprehension of our personal relation to the whole matter, this principle may be expressed in a word—Responsibility. We may be perfectly justified—or we may not—in paying others to fight for us; but, we cannot thereby transfer responsibility. If we cannot bear arms, we can at least ensure that those who do, are adequately paid and rightly organised; that the system of administration which the greatest authorities advocate (with an admirable patience) is established; and that, finally, if a man, whether he