

steam navy throughout the world, we may be able to utilise them to give power to our own fleet instead of finding them turned to the destruction of our commerce. Thirdly, by completing, in absolute security, under our own control, our telegraphic communication with our distant dependencies and outlying forts. Lastly, by having at home an effective army actually ready at any moment to be made complete, of such strength as a mercantile marine like ours can suddenly and rapidly ship, with all its stores, with all its needed land transport, and can deliver in *an unknown direction*, supported at home by such a force of volunteers and militia as will, when actual invasion threatens, in the sense in which it did in 1805, enable the whole body together to take the field; and when it does not, will enable the active army to be employed for the defence of the Empire, and the fulfilment of national obligations.

So far as our own immediate offensive strength against Russia is concerned, we hold that it depends first on our navy; and secondly upon our being able to prepare for instant action as large a force as we can promptly ship from our ports. We ought at least, in the first instance, to work up to the standard at which the Government is now aiming: that of putting two army corps and a cavalry division into a condition for effective action abroad, the only true and proper defence of our empire. We believe firmly that no German military authority would look upon the power we should so possess as the equivalent only of the force of Roumania, as Sir Charles Dilke declares. The Roumanian army in the field may be considerably larger than two *corps d'armée* and a cavalry division. It is one thing to have such a force on hand; it is another thing to be able to deliver with it a blow in any direction we choose, while we also possess the command of the sea.

But in order that such a force able to serve as a nucleus for allies may also be able to strike effectually, it is essential to us that entry should be possible for us into the Black Sea as well as the Baltic. In India our whole advantage lies in forcing Russia to act as far from her base as possible, and in striking her line of communications through Persia, as has been admirably pointed out already by Col. Mapleson. To announce beforehand that we restrict aggression to an attack upon Vladivostock, is to abandon the most effective part of our special strength—the uncertainty of the direction of our blow.

It is rather remarkable that in speaking of Vladivostock Sir Charles has not drawn attention to the essentially *offensive* purpose with which Russia is strengthening her fleet. Yet it is no secret that had war with Russia broken out a few years ago, it was her purpose to have struck thence directly upon our Australian colonies, and that the knowledge of that fact has been the great motive which has led our colonists to set seriously to work to arm and prepare themselves. It may, on that account, be necessary that one of our earliest blows should be struck at Vladivostock.

The danger with which Russia menaces us at present, however, is her steady progress toward our Indian frontier, extending her dominion over tribes at such a distance from us that we cannot with advantage to ourselves reach her during her progress, while yet she is continually more and more able to employ those tribes in harassing us. Hence it becomes of the greatest importance to judge what the real character of the Russian army is, and whether it is, as Sir Charles Dilke has alleged, so overwhelmingly powerful in Europe that, even with such allies as will be glad to join us in the task of opposing it, we have reason to fear the issue. The Russian infantry undoubtedly has those characteristics of which Sir Charles has spoken. The men are ready to die silently, and without troublesome enquiries as to what they are ordered to do. As long as it was possible to form masses of them into great columns, and to push them forward regardless of loss of life into the field of battle, the power of their obstinate heroism and of their numbers was enormous. But the effects of the breech-loader on the character of modern fighting has made itself felt, and the sacrifice of life in the attempt of 1877-78 upon Constantinople was melancholy.

The national characteristics of the Russian peasantry have not changed. The conditions of Russian life, and the absence of the men who could intelligently lead them in the subordinate ranks, are as marked as ever. All military observers who look below surfaces note it now as much as then. These factors in the estimate are absolutely ignored by Sir Charles Dilke. The Russian cavalry of all classes have recently been converted into a sort of imitation of the mounted rifles who constituted the cavalry of the American war. The Cossacks are not trained infantry soldiers in any sense of the term. They are not men accustomed from childhood to the use of rifles, as were the American marksmen. They are as unlike highly effective mounted infantry as it is possible for men to be. Yet Sir Charles Dilke would impress upon his readers the belief that there is no kind of doubt as to their superiority to all cavalry which trusts chiefly to the proper weapon of the true cavalry soldiers—the *arme blanche*. There is no country in Europe from which decisive authority may not be quoted against him. German, Austrian, and French opinions are all to the contrary. But the most effective exposure of the weakness of the present Russian cavalry has come from a Russian pen, that of Colonel Baïkov, who shows not only that the present system is absolutely contrary to all sound principle, but that it is hopelessly unsuited to the habits and traditions of the Russian cavalry itself. We certainly do not deny the numerical force of the Russian artillery. But artillery is an arm exceptionally difficult to send in vast masses great distances from home over difficult country and to keep supplied with the forage and the ammunition it needs. If our points of attack are well chosen, however great may be the numbers of the Russian artillery at home, on the field of battle we ought not to meet with them in overwhelming force.

E. S.

THE PURPOSE OF PAIN.

It has always been contended, as a partial explanation of pain, that it acted as a protection to the human race, which, if it felt no pain from certain acts, might never learn to avoid them. That is certainly a truth as regards some acts, such as taking hot coals from a fire, or drinking boiling water, or walking carelessly over rough ground, all which men avoid, because they have had, either personally or through the testimony of others, experience of pain. "The burnt child," said the old cooks, who reduced wisdom to pemmican, "dreads the fire," and so they popularised the idea of protection as the apology for pain. Unfortunately, however, this form of protection is singularly imperfect, the pain bearing no kind of proportion or ratio to the danger involved. A man may have agony from toothache, which, except for the pain it involves, does not matter; but if he has a great aneurism, with a consequent liability to sudden death or a liver "saturated with cancer," from which there is no recovery, he obtains no warning from pain. Pain gives no warning against malaria, or many infections; while some of the poisons—opium, for instance—inflict no pain at all. The protecting influence of pain, though it exists, is therefore comparatively of small importance, and as an explanation of the reason for pain, is totally inadequate. So, it has long been conceded, is its directly educating influence. Not to mention that many human beings pass from the cradle to the grave without experiencing physical pain, and that the allowance of pain served out by circumstances or Providence is astoundingly unequal—those who say it is not, never felt acute pain—it is an open question still whether pain makes men, on the whole, better or worse. It makes a few men better, past all question; but they will generally be sincere devotees of some creed which teaches resignation, and the majority of mankind believe in no creed of the kind. Pain makes the natural man very angry; and in a savage state he attributes it to witchcraft, partly, no doubt, in order to make the resulting vindictiveness seem rational. The Australian who breaks his arm "goes for" his nearest enemy at once, on the plea that he has obviously and unmistakably bewitched him. The modern world is not inclined to believe that pain makes children better, having, in fact, banished the old idea about the curative influence of the rod; and though many modern ideas are erroneous, that one has much evidence in its favour. We should say that among the unchastened races pain develops much more evil than good, and tended on the whole, to deteriorate man, as it is believed to have deteriorated the carnivores; and even among the civilised its effects are either null or evil. It would be hard to prove that women are morally the better for their tortures in childbirth; while the effect of much pain on men is as often resentment or chronic bitterness, as patience or resignation. The dread of pain, again, is the grand cause of cowardice, as well as of caution, and though the virtue of courage may be over-praised—we do not think so, for courage is unselfishness—it is impossible to deny that cowardice, except when wholly involuntary, is a noxious vice. Strike out of the world the selfishness developed by fear of pain, and it would not only be a happier world, which may not signify, but a better world, which certainly does. Yet if the ultimate reason for pain is its educating influence, its effect should always be seen at least in a tendency towards good.

Is it not conceivably possible—we offer it as a suggestion to be considered—and not as a theory to be accepted—that the object with which pain is sent into the world is not the development of man's moral nature so much as the development of his energy? Man can do one thing, which God, from His very perfectness, cannot do, and that is, make an effort; and whatever the grand concealed purpose, a part of it must be that man should strive. We may not see what he can do by striving, or how he can add by striving to the store of force in the universe; but if he were not intended to strive, to develop will, and display energy, and make exertions, the world would surely have been made a very different one from what it is. It is always whipping him up, him and the animals too. There are only two forms of pain which are absolutely universal among sentient creatures, which men feel as strongly as women, and animals more keenly than both, and which human beings, whether refined or degraded, absolutely refuse to endure; and those two are hunger and thirst, the two grand impelling forces of the world. Without those two pains there would be no world such as we know it. The wild animals would saunter away life doing nothing; the useful beast, released alike from hunger and the whip, would be worthless to man; and man himself, though he might reflect as well as saunter, would scarcely be brought to work. There are other whips, no doubt, and to thinkers who confuse Western Europe with the world, those whips may appear most potent; but take away thirst and hunger, and Asia and Africa—that is, three-fourths of mankind—would sink back in resigned calm, lazy, and probably intensely vicious, lotos-eaters. Why do things, when resting brings no pain? That is the creed of the few places where food involves little labour; and if it involved none anywhere, that would have been the creed of the restless Aryan, who is at the top now mainly because he felt the necessity of escaping pain more keenly than his neighbours, and could inflict more pain on them. Is it not possible that a painless world—if we could conceive of such a thing, and that is more difficult than the unreflecting think—would be a world with indefinitely less energy in it, that is a world less capable of working out the divine purpose, whatever that purpose may be? Is it, in fact, not conceivable that the object of the mystery of pain is the production of energy? We can all see that is the result, with animals as well as human beings, of the only two pains to which every sentient creature is liable; and may it not also be the result of the remainder? Many men escape pain all their lives, but all are affected, and in some sense dominated by the knowledge that pain is in the world and may be shared by themselves. Men cannot