

every army. What nonsense they must have thought Lord Shaftesbury's generous letter about obedience." I would venture to draw your attention to the fact that the sentence I have quoted from the bitterest of all satirists—who, since he belonged to the nation which conquered the world, must have had some idea of what soldiering then was—was applied by him to a petulant and debauched woman desiring the death of her slave, and not to any soldier; and that the record we all know of Roman discipline is that of one conscious that he was set "under authority," and on that account, and by virtue of that only, having under him those to whom he said "go," and they went.

If anyone who does not know the English Army doubts that that is the spirit in which duty has always been carried on in it, I would ask him to turn to that record which is for all English soldiers, the sure reference book for study of discipline, the one for the completion and perfecting of which, the world owes so much to your Grace. He will find there one curious fact. While for a cause which is therein most carefully recorded, namely, the necessity for not letting the enemy know when you have a secret, he who was the conqueror never assigns the reason for any tactical movement; on the other hand, no order on points of discipline is ever issued without the clearest explanation as to the reason for it, or without the order being given in such a manner that every one to whom it was addressed must have distinctly understood that the Duke considered it his duty to give that order as much as it was theirs to obey it.

I venture to think that the faculty for so giving an order as to leave that impression, is the most valuable one which any soldier could urge you to cultivate.

But to proceed. The fact that the giving of an order is a duty, involves the further consideration, that it is a duty to see that order carried out. The petulant dame may ten minutes hence change her mind and wish her slave not dead after all. The soldier whose duty it is to be obeyed, cannot afford ever to give an order which he will not remember to have given, and over the full execution of which will not watch. Not only not so much because it is important that the particular thing should be done, as because any single instance in which an order is not obeyed, makes those under him feel doubtful whether he seriously intends to enforce any order. I think that it is this necessity for combining with it the fullest possible confidence in all subordinates who are worthy of it, which makes the long association of men together who are in war to work together, so valuable. The Duke's orders in the Peninsula, if you trace them carefully, are in this respect one of the most wonderful studies I know. When any case comes before him, he first decides the particular matter on its merits; then he draws from the data which are supplied to him inferences as to the manner in which various orders wholly unconnected with the immediate matter in hand are being carried out. Yet the whole is done with the most perfect straightforwardness simply on the data necessarily laid before him.

Perhaps the next point to which I shall refer will make the possibility of this supervision without suspicion, more evident. There are from the very nature of the case two classes of things to be done. One class, like my favourite polishing of buckles, in which the thing itself is of comparatively little importance, and in which it gains its whole value from the manner in which it sets the

machinery of organization in motion; the other, the instances of which are very rare in peace and very common in war, in which the thing to be done, is of so much importance that it must be done, at the moment, no matter if even the manner of doing it gives something of a jar to the usual arrangement. Of the latter class, the most perfect instance perhaps occurs alike at peace and in war, when, as always has happened hitherto, at the moment at which a field gun is to be brought into action, the gunners are panting in the distance far behind, and Generals and their staffs jump down to push forward the weapon to the all important point. In cases like that, where previous precautions for efficiency having been neglected, the mischief has to be remedied at all cost, at the fatal moment of course no one can be out of place in lending a hand to get all that can be done, done, and Generals must be ready, as they ever have been, even to do work which a ploughman, were he only there, could probably better perform. But the cases when such costly waste of labour are necessary in peace time are happily very rare. That to which I want to draw your attention is the other case. That being not one of emergency, the mere simple peace duty tends to send the life blood flowing through the whole organization, if you take the right way of doing it, and you may help to throw it all out of gear by just taking the wrong way. Let me illustrate. You have to inspect, as we ordinarily say, a certain number of men—that is, you have to see that they have turned out with their accoutrements in proper order. The sergeant in immediate charge of them has reported to the sergeant-major, (a) who has reported to you that all his correct. You inspect them, and find that some man has appeared on parade improperly dressed in some respect—with a dirty buckle, if you like. What are you going to do? To find fault first of all, and most gravely, with the man who certainly ought to have cleaned his buckle? Well, look what you will have done if you do that. First of all you will have told the sergeant who was responsible that the man turned out properly upon parade, as clearly as if you had put it into so many words to him, "I don't care in the least that you should do your duty. I shall do my best in future, as I have done now, to dispense with your services and to use my own eyes." If he is a good soldier, proud of being responsible for his own men, and of seeing that they are properly turned out, you will have utterly disgusted him by ignoring him, even though he made the slip of noticing the man. If he is a bad sergeant he will quietly calculate that as far as you are concerned, he need trouble no further to do his duty, for he knows you have no intention of looking after him. Secondly, precisely the same calculation will have taken place in your sergeant-major's (a) mind, and not only will the strictness with which he will look after that sergeant suffer, but so far as you are concerned he will lose all interest in, and all care to make any of the sergeants under him, do their duty.

But supposing you have reversed the process and spoken to the man who was actually and directly responsible to you—the sergeant-major, (a) Your remonstrance need, if he is at all a decent man, be very slight. Possibly if he is a man who knows what it is to be proud of seeing that the non-commissioned officers under him do their duty, he will take the whole blame upon himself, and will simply tell you that it shan't occur

(a) Or "colour-sergeant."

again. What have you then done? That one little word directed to the right man instead of the wrong one, has had all these effects. Not only will that sergeant who neglected to report to the sergeant-major (a) know well that the sergeant-major will look very sharp after him, another time but every sergeant will know that the sergeant-major has had his eyes sharpened by having made a slip. Every private will know very soon that all these non-commissioned officers have been by this means awakened to a much sharper attention to their duties. Nor, unless things are in a very bad condition, will the effect be only on such small matters as buckles; for the sergeant-major, and, therefore, the sergeants will have been aroused to look after all their duties, and which is the most important of all, you will thus to a considerable extent have produced an effect on those matters on which your eye could directly never fall.

I remember having once said something of this kind by way of explaining to a friend the kind of interest which our work had in it, upon which he said, "Yes, and then your system comes down with the whole pressure of everybody on the poor private." Exactly the reverse is really the case. Take the instance I have put. If you notice the private's conduct only to himself, man will run the chance of escaping your eye, which is the only one, as you have taken care they shall understand, which will be over them. How are you to stop this but by endeavouring to get an occasional example made, and one certain to be an unfair one. On the other hand, if you have succeeded in making your non-commissioned officers do their duty, the irregularity will have been prevented in most cases, and the very slightest fault-finding on most occasions will be sufficient. Moreover, you will have trained yourself in a habit inestimably valuable under present conditions of warfare, that of having your orders carried out through the active instead of the merely passive agency of others.

I could enlarge much on this subject, and of course what is true of these the lower ranks of the Army, is equally true in a far higher degree as you ascend upwards. It depends entirely on how far you succeed in establishing such a system of making each rank do its own work and no one else's whether you do or do not get things into healthy order by our peace service for war. I have no kind of doubt that it was some such process of a definite system of graduated authority and work "established and well understood," as the Duke said of it in his letter to Sir John Burgoyne, that Prochu referred when he spoke of "peace making Armies efficient, and war tending to impair their efficiency."

I am very far from intending to suggest that it is advisable to keep the privates at a distance from you. On the contrary, in relation to any matter in which your non-commissioned officers have done their duty so far as using their eyes is concerned, I should say that there is yet another matter in which you have to guide them, that of the manner of dealing with their men. Sir Thomas Acland, speaking of non-commissioned officers, and, if I remember rightly, of Officers also, complains that they have, as a rule, singularly little "teaching faculty." I strongly suspect that an Oxford first-class man is likely to know more about the right method of teaching in general than most of us do, and that we are very foolish if we do

(a) Or "colour-sergeant."