

to its non-performance. The committee expressed an opinion that the shooting of the force should not be left entirely dependent on voluntary effort and voluntary contributions. The War Office people seem to have given special heed to this particular matter, as they have, with quite an unusual display of liberality, decreed that an extra grant of £1 shall be given during 1893 and 1894 to each N. C. O. and private who, in addition to making himself efficient under previous regulations, passes out of the third class in musketry. Generosity does not even stop here, for the sum of 3s. 6d. towards payment of expenses and loss of time in attending the ranges will be allowed annually to each man who fulfils the requirement by which he earns the contingent allowance. This welcome, though somewhat tardy, recognition of the fact that if yeomen are to be entrusted with carbines they should be offered inducements to acquire proficiency in their use, is one of the most encouraging signs of the times.

Under the dispensation so soon to come in force the establishment of the Yeomanry, exclusive of officers and permanent staff, will be 10,900. The last published efficiency return was 8,741, so that the force has a good deal to do ere it lives up to the full authorised strength. Instead of skeleton troops averaging 35 men, we shall now see squadrons with a maximum strength of 100 members; the minimum is 70. Any squadron, which after April, 1895, is found to have fallen below the latter figure in its efficiency strength, will incur the risk of being broken up. This will create a standard of efficiency never before dreamed of by the average Yeoman, but too indifferent generally to standards of any kind. The auxiliary cavalry should now be on its mettle; its place in the scheme of national defence is for the first time clearly defined; its organization, which entailed such a waste of power, compared with the results attained, has made way for a system at once more military, more workable, and at the same time cheaper by some £13,000.

* * *

In connection with the foregoing, the following item from the *Army and Navy Gazette* is of interest:

"The introduction of the squadron system was long and strenuously opposed by cavalry officers who were said to belong to 'the old school;' but the late Colonel Valentine Baker and other energetic reformers finally carried the day. For service and war purposes the squadron is the proper unit, but the change from troop to squadron has, we are told by some, led to results which were not foreseen by the Duke of Cambridge and other cavalry officers who opposed it. His Royal Highness was moved by the apprehension that advantage would be taken of the new system to agitate for reduction in the number of officers in cavalry regiments. The agitation has not as yet been apparent. Under the old system, say the 'old school,' the colonel and adjutant commanded the regiment, and discipline and administration were uniform. Now, it is argued by cavalry officers of great experience, the squadron system has taken the command out of the hands of the colonel and his adjutant, and transferred it to four commanding officers, each of whom may have, and probably has, his own ideas about discipline, one being smart, another lax, a third uncertain, a fourth fidgety, so that one squadron is smart, another slovenly, another discontented, the fourth worried one day and happy the next, and so forth. We do not condemn the squadron system, but we insist upon the necessity of the colonel, with the aid of the adjutant, controlling in all its details the discipline and the internal economy of the regiment.

HOW A MAN FEELS UNDER FIRE.

"How does a man feel under fire?" is a question of interest to men who have had the experience as well as to those who have not had it. We are all anxious to know what may be the mental impressions of any one of our fellows in circumstances generally supposed to be a test of bravery or courage, especially since most of us have had no such test. We Anglo-Saxons, as we call ourselves for want of a better term, attach extraordinary consequence to our

readiness to undergo exposure, in case of need, to danger and death. During the Civil War, as war correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, I learned to the full what it is to be in range of balls and bullets of every calibre and variety. During the first eight or nine months of the war, I heard, in divers reconnaissances and skirmishes in Missouri and Kentucky, and on the Mississippi, a great deal of martial music performed by musket, rifle and cannon, and even learned to distinguish the sound of different balls as they whizzed by. But I did not know what it was to be in a regular battle until we were at Fort Donelson (February 1862), where I received, I may say, my baptism of fire. The morning of the second day of the siege, I was wandering on foot through a wood, trying to see how the battle was going. There was continuous firing to the left, and the frequent whizzing of bullets over our heads. Abruptly the Confederates opened on us from an adjacent battery with grape and canister. The shot rattled all round us, cutting down the bare twigs and boughs above, and ploughing up the ground in our immediate vicinity. It was so abrupt, and the source was so invisible, that I was fairly startled at first, but I was exhilarated also. It seemed like real war. The sensation was genuine and not unpleasurable, because, perhaps, I saw nobody struck.

It makes a deal of difference with one's feelings, under fire, when one is an eye-witness of casualties in the immediate neighbourhood. The sense of danger is greatly increased as well as the likelihood of death, if men are falling around one—if somebody at one's side receives a ghastly or a mortal wound. Wounds and death in the concrete appear very different from what they do in the abstract. Time and experience are needed not to be deeply moved by the inevitable horrors of war. Usage makes us to a certain extent callous to our surroundings, however painful. In battle, every soldier is under obligation to be firm, to obey orders, to be faithful to his cause. If he falters or flies he is disgraced, punished, irrevocably ruined. On the other hand, if he does what he should do, he is esteemed, honoured, promoted. As a matter of policy, of self-interest, therefore, is it not strange that any soldier should shirk or flinch under any circumstances? A soldier in his first engagement is inclined to a presentiment of death, and is often surprised when it is over to find that he is still alive. In his twentieth or tenth engagement his presentiments have disappeared with his nervousness, and he is cool in the presence of peril.

What is known as courage is, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, a matter of discipline. A man is alarmed at danger in the beginning, not so much because he is timid as because danger is new to him. The trite proverb that familiarity breeds contempt is measurably true of war. The coward of to-day may be the hero of to-morrow. The nerves that tremble at the outset may be strong as steel at the termination. Everything comes by education, intrepidity included. Raw troops are always untrustworthy, simply because of their rawness. The same troops as veterans do not blanch in the face of death. It may be hard to count on a man's courage, but it would be madness to count on his cowardice. Almost any human being will be fearless with certain provocations, from certain motives. Much depends on the cause and his attachment to it. He may be craven in one thing and dauntless in another. Men feel very differently under fire at first, but much alike at last. They can all be made to endure it becomingly, creditably, after repeated trials. The incurable coward is almost as exceptional as the congenital idiot. In speaking of prowess we must distinguish between bravery and courage. Bravery is, in a strict sense, constitutional absence of fear: courage may fear greatly and still be capable, by strength of will and determination, of overcoming, or at least resisting, fear. Bravery if it sees the danger does not feel it; advances in its teeth without pause or tremor; it is superior to place or pressure. Courage is quite consistent with physical timidity, being mainly mental, and susceptible of improvement and expansion. It is strongest where morality is on its side, where conscience approves. Bravery may be material, brutal; courage belongs to the highest organizations. Bravery is inborn and necessarily rare. Courage is evolved, and may, with a given environment, reach the loftiest heroism.—*Junius Henri Browne, in "Worthington's Illustrated Magazine."*