

ing down a policy, which would obtain international concurrence, by which his countrymen might be relieved of the burdens which the need of constant preparation for war imposes upon them.

In the last seventeen years, France has expended hundreds of millions of dollars upon defensive fortifications—defences which, in part, at least, are now, it is said, rendered obsolete by the discovery of new appliances for carrying on offensive warfare. She is spending at the present time for the mere maintenance of her army about \$140,000,000 per annum, and more than \$40,000,000 per annum, for the maintenance of her navy. This tremendous outlay is nearly equivalent to the entire expense of the United States government, less what is paid in pensions and what is put aside for a sinking fund. Thus, in 1887, the entire expenditures of the French government were \$625,000,000, against an expenditure during the same time, of \$315,000,000 for the United States. And yet, our country, from the extent of its territory, the richness of its natural resources, the energy and intelligence of its people, and the amount of capital which all classes of society have at their command, could bear a load of taxation with far greater ease than it can be borne by France.

If, at the present time, a responsible member of our government made the announcement, that, unless hundreds of millions of dollars were immediately spent in defences, our people would have to look forward to ignominious defeat in a war which could not long be delayed, an appeal would go up from all intelligent Americans, that government actions be immediately taken to see if it was

not possible, by some form of international arrangement, in accord with the dictates of modern civilization, to avert a choice between two such dreaded alternatives. But in France no such demand seems to be made. The leading men of that country seem to believe that they are bound by the "fatality of events," and that there is no other way out of the terrible strait into which they have fallen, but to continue to build new fortifications, to increase the size of their army, in spite of the fact, evident to others, if not to themselves, that all this fore-shadows sooner or later an era of national bankruptcy.

It may be said that this is not the fault of France; that European diplomacy is under the control of the Emperor of Germany, who believes that in this age all national gains worth the having are acquired by force. While in a general way this may be true, and while it would be idle to expect much support from the Emperor to a plan for international disarmament, it seems to us, as it has seemed to others, that even the German Emperor, powerful as he is, could not hold his own in opposition to a popular demand for relief from subsisting military burdens.

No one who has travelled in Germany, or who has talked with the German people, needs to be told that compulsory military service and large annual expenditures upon the army are not popular with them. They endure the burden only for the reason that German statesmen assure them that it is necessary for the protection of their country. Hence, if they could be convinced that it was unnecessary, that their neighbors in France and Russia, whose movements they are ever watching, would not and could not attack