

## DOING WITHOUT SOLDIERS.

(From the Broad Arrow.)

It is delightful to meet a real visionary in this realistic age—a being with the experiences of Sandford and Merton, and the philosophy of Rousseau. And yet, why should we be so delighted? The existence of such a being is guaranteed us by many common facts, hardly perhaps regarded in this curious and interesting light. Do not quick advertisements prove that grey hairs are no necessary accompaniment of age? that short people need not despair? and that the human nose may be trained like the verbena or the vine? Is it not demonstrated that medical men can be dispensed with by keeping in store certain patent pills, unguents, and plasters? Have we not books intended to make every man his own lawyer, his own veterinary surgeon, in fact every thing but his own grave digger? All the learned professions whose members live upon the ills or quarrels of others are clearly unnecessary in the modern utilitarian and visionary philosophy. Men are no longer a bundle of habits, but a bundle of professions, and he is obviously able to do everything for himself.

Need we be alarmed if this visionary tendency affect military matters? Banish the doctor, the lawyer, the conveyancer, and the judge, and there is clearly no need of the soldier. If there are to be no more quarrels, and universal peace is coming, growing out of universal brotherhood and the banishment of all wrong and injustice, we may settle the conditions of the new social state according to our fancy. Let us get rid of politicians, who make laws that have to be mended, and unmake what their predecessors have made. Let us get rid of financiers, who tax us until we have only four shillings in every pound we own that we can call our own. Let us eliminate all evil, and begin life afresh, with bread enough for us all, and love, music, poetry, and happiness for everybody. We may as well be thorough while we are about it; and, if the golden age is to return, let us take crook and pipe and resume the proceedings of a pastoral era. Our only chance of escape from present evils is by resuming a primitive simplicity. We must forego all we have gained, including the daily newspaper, and take to sleep, milk, and apples, as things of course.

We can't turn curds to milk again,  
Nor now, by wishing, back to then;  
And having tasted stolen honey,  
We can't buy innocence for money.

But, not to be led away by the visionaries, let us make a generalization. Time still tells its tale, in spite of scientific appliances; doctors are still needed, though patent medicines were never so abundant; lawyers abound, through *causæ mecum* are common; and evil is not less common, through centuries of preaching and millions of preachers have been at work upon it; similarly, soldiers exist, though peace upon earth has been the creed of Christian people for eighteen hundred years. It is no use resisting the inevitable, and men and women who desire to abolish the soldier are no more reasonable than those who wish to abolish the physician or the student of the law. There are quacks of many kinds, and the anti-military quack is the least reasonable of all.

Examined, for instance, what the soldier's functions are. He has been called the international policeman, and hence may have run away with the notion that he only exists for international purposes. This is a part of his *raison d'être*, but by no means the whole. He exists for attack but also for defence, and for defence in its broadest

sense—the defence of the country, the Sovereign, the law and the constitution. We may be imperilled by a foreign foe, and soldiers cannot be extemporized any more than physicians and lawyers can be. We might be threatened by an internal revolution. The soldier represents law and order. He is sworn to maintain both. He is the ultimate resort of law. Our liberties are guaranteed by law, but what guarantees the law? The constitution! Well, that is a quibble; but what guarantees the constitution? Force, physical force, represented on the one side by the policeman, on the other by the soldiers. When one resort fails, recourse is had to the other. No one thinks of abolishing the policeman, but it is fashionable, in some circles, and with certain savans, to discuss the abolition of the soldier as if he were a superfluity, only useful in case we want to attack, perfectly unnecessary where we only wish to defend. This may be called social science, but it deserves no other name. Any single right that we possess may come to be guaranteed by the most skilled physical force. The policeman guards our houses, and he is trained in order that he may do it. He is to all intents and purposes a soldier, though he is unskilled in the use of the rifle, and dresses in blue. He has many functions to perform, and they cannot wisely be delegated to any one else. The soldier is a superior policeman. He represents another branch of law, yet he may be called upon to see the execution of the ordinary laws of order and decency. We may not want him often, but he is ready to our hand in case we do. We do not love and respect our neighbors because hanging is the punishment for murder, but it is sometimes necessary to enforce law in this rough and summary way. Thus we are apt to reason as if law made itself or were capable of carrying itself out; as if the constitution were everything, and the physical force upon which it reposes nothing. But, though Atlas may carry the world on his back, he must have something to stand upon, even if it be a tortoise.

Great Britain is a compound of classes and interests, many of them in fierce and unceasing rivalry. Respect for law protects the rights of each, and the law ranges through the civic to the military, as we have shown. The nobleman enjoys resistance, if needs be, against all who would hinder him in free and full use and enjoyments. The home of the poor man is his castle, for the same reason. A revolt, and soldiers have had to put it down. And it is, in part, this consciousness of physical resistance to insurrection that makes us as respectful nationally as it does individually when our thoughts soar no higher than the policeman. The removal of grievances by force is an exploded dogma. The Chartists were divided upon it, the Fenians have suffered for it, and it is now disclaimed by the most hot-headed demagogues. We owe the result to education and experience, to a belief in the certainty of punishment, a profound impression of the loyalty of the military class. The check is so subtle that we never think of it; it has become a part of our national conscience. But not the less dangerous would it be to remove it. Remove the insensible restraints of home, of civilization, and see what men become! Remove the military embodiment of law, and what might be the result?

*Calbourn's Magazine*, writing of English naval ordnance, says: "The system of rifling which destroyed its gun and damaged 70 per cent. of its shell in the effort to accom-

plish the least useful work, was that preferred in the competition of 1865, and, being named the 'Woolwich' system is still in use. The present infliction of injuries upon heavy ordnance thus rifled by their escaping projectiles, which necessitates the minute inspection after every fifty discharges, a cool target practice, and has disabled so many guns, makes thoughtful anti-lectists ask what might be the effect upon British guns of another naval bombardment of a Japanese fort; while the failure to perforate the 'Glutton's' turret awakens attention to the meaning of a rifle system which has decidedly the lowest velocities.' And the small contents of the 700-lb. common shell reminds us that the relative bombarding value of shells correspond with the squares of their bursting charges, so that, as to the most powerful shell, the 35-ton, 25-ton 18-ton, and 12-ton guns stand respectively as the numbers 405, 1,225, 649, and 324. The failure of rotary power necessitated the shortening of the shell, and consequent diminution of powder capacity; so that these bombarding values originally stood at 405, 2,070, 1,024, and 324 respectively. It will thence be seen that the bursting power of the 12-inch common shell for the 35-ton gun is only one-fifth that of the original 12-inch shell for the 25-ton gun."

The London Naval and Military Gazette waxes humorous at recent collisions in the British navy. "The colliding system appears to have come in for a bad time. Running aground having been a trifle overdone, collisions are now more *en règle*. Certainly the example was set by a flag officer's ship running down one of his own, squadron, a costly iron clad, which appears to have been more damaged than was at first anticipated, and it is not, perhaps, a matter of much moment that smaller vessels, like the *Tholia* and *Lia y*, should follow the one thus set, them by an officer who is held in the highest estimation at Whitehall, and doubtless is equally popular in the squadron he commands. Further, while cracking an iron-clad is not taken any serious notice of, there having been no court-martial to investigate the case, it would seem unnecessary fussily to haul over the coals a commanding officer who merely smashes up the elaborate figure-head of some *Anna Maria* of the mercantile marine. Therefore, like A. Ward, 'we'll let it pass.' But in the *Lively's* case there seems to have been an almost comical feature, and the old adage, 'More haste less speed,' seems to have been especially applicable; for in going at top speed to avoid an expected gale she ran into a schooner almost before she knew she was there, and had consequently to take the longest vessel into tow, and do tug's duty, which is by no means 'lively' work. We expect the *Caledonia's* leave men, who were taking passage on board, will return by rail, and thus avoid any more of that exercise known as 'rammole' drill."

It is understood that the Government scheme for military reorganization, which is shortly to be presented to the Assembly, divides the French troops into four units, capable of prompt mobilization in time of war. Each of these armies is to be divided into three army corps, with their headquarters established in large towns. *Each corps* is to consist of three divisions of infantry, one brigade of cavalry, two regiments of artillery, and one regiment of engineers. Each corps is also to have two regiments of reserve artillery.